

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A HOLOCAUST SURVIVOR'S  
LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives a letter written to President Reagan by Mr. Charles Feldman, who resides in my congressional district, in Rego Park, NY.

Mr. Feldman survived the Holocaust, although many of his family members did not. He wrote to the President several weeks ago, urging him not to visit the Bitburg military cemetery in Germany, where 49 of Hitler's elite SS stormtroopers are buried.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is unlike any I have ever read. Today is May 9, and President Reagan has been to Bitburg. But I bring Charles Feldman's letter to the attention of the Members of this body because we cannot afford to forget the atrocities of the Holocaust or who its true victims were.

The President has equated the SS guardsmen with the millions of innocent people butchered in Nazi death camps. Like many of us, Charles Feldman differs with the President. He saw Nazis shoot down entire families lined up in front of freshly dug graves. He was forced to load the dead and half-dead bodies of his friends and neighbors and their children into mass graves. He lived through the nightmare known as the Holocaust, and he does not equate the Nazi murderers with the children, adults, and elderly who were marched into gas chambers or firing squads.

In his letter, which follows, I have deleted the names of the victims he speaks of, to protect their families and friends still alive who may be unaware of the episodes Mr. Feldman recounts.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to read this letter, but I urge all of my colleagues to do so. It certainly was not easy to write, and Mr. Feldman is to be congratulated for his courage.

APRIL 23, 1985.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The furor which your forthcoming trip to Germany has evoked has finally prompted me to put down on paper a true story which I have been carrying inside for the past 42 years.

In the Fall of 1942 (end of September/beginning October) I was in the Zwolin Ghetto. The Nazis made an announcement that all Ghetto inhabitants were to assemble in the market square at a certain hour, bringing with them a small valise with per-

sonal belongings. Anyone not appearing as ordered would be hunted down and shot. As soon as this announcement was made, all the Jews in the Ghetto panicked. We were so tightly boxed in that no one could possibly escape without notice. I had Polish non-Jewish papers (forged, of course), but even so I could not escape from the Ghetto.

On the day everyone had been ordered to congregate in the market square a great panic broke out because Germans began shooting and terrorizing everyone haphazardly, just for the fun of it. When order was restored and the people were standing in the market square, the Ghetto was strewn with dead bodies and the streets were full of blood. The Germans organized the tens of thousands of Jews into lines and marched them out of the Ghetto and the town to a train station called Garbatka where they were herded and packed like cattle into train cars and sent to Treblinka. Ten members of my immediate family were among those sent away at that time.

While the people were marching, the Germans were shooting at them. How do I know this? Before the people were formed into lines to be marched away to the train station, the Germans picked out about 65 of 70 strong young men and kept them to one side. I was among them. After all the other Jews has been taken away from the Ghetto, we young men were still waiting in the market square, wondering what our fate would be and why we had been left behind.

Suddenly, from out of nowhere came a small child—a pretty, blond, girl aged about 4 or 5 years—clutching a piece of bread and an apple. She ran over to a young man in our group whom she recognized as being a neighbor from her town. She called out to him, . . . (his name) and ran to him, crying, "where is my Mama and Papa?". The man, . . . told her to go away, and he gave her a gentle push. The child went, but came back a little while later to Sumer. Again he gently pushed her away, but she continuously kept returning to him because she had nowhere else to go and no one else to go to.

Soon we found out why we had been kept back from marching with the others. The Germans ordered us to clean up the Ghetto and remove the dead bodies and take them for communal burial in a nearby cemetery. We rounded up about 150 bodies and took them to an already prepared communal grave, and threw them in. The little girl accompanied us all the time.

When I came up to the grave I saw several bodies already lying on the edge—not thrown in. These were people who had been caught outside the Ghetto, were marched back into the Ghetto and taken alive to the grave and had then been shot. One of these people was a man I knew from my home town—a neighbor by the name of . . . He was still alive but was unable to move. He recognized me and called my name. I could hardly recognize him as he had been shot and was covered with blood. He asked me if I knew anything about his parents, and said he couldn't die without knowing what had happened to his family. But I could not stand talking to him because the Germans were watching and I had to go back and pick up more bodies from the Ghetto.

Finally our task was finished and the last of the dead had been thrown into the grave. The little girl was still accompanying us. Then one of the guards picked up his rifle and aimed it at her, and fired. He missed, so he fired again, this time hitting her. She fell on the edge of the mass grave; her body motionless, ready to be thrown in with the rest.

I learned from the man she called . . . that this child was from a wealthy Jewish family who had entrusted her to a Polish non-Jewish family. They had paid with everything they had for this Polish family to keep and hide their child, but apparently after the parents had been sent out of the Ghetto the child was left to fend for herself.

Surprisingly enough we 70 young men were not killed and buried in that mass grave. The Germans kept us to clean up the Ghetto and help them remove all the Jews' belongings from the empty Ghetto houses. This took a few weeks. During that time on a particular afternoon I saw a wagon pulled by two horses and being driven by two Polish policemen whom I knew well, pass by the Ghetto. In the wagon was a young woman and a small child. The woman was . . . a girl from my home town who I knew, and the child was her son. She spoke to me and said she and the little boy (not more than two years old) had been caught hiding, and she asked if I knew where she was being taken. I knew that she was being taken to Gestapo headquarters. However, as the wagon did not stop there was no opportunity for me to have any conversation with her. But I knew anyway what her fate would be.

Included in the 70 young men who had been kept for the clean-up work were a few Jewish policemen. One of them, the leader, was a man we had nick-named . . . As he was the lead and in close contact with the Gestapo to receive orders for us I asked him if he could help this mother and child. He told me there was nothing he could do to save them, and that in all probability they would both be shot. Then I asked him if he could arrange for me to be the one to bury them and say a quiet prayer for them, and he agreed.

The next day another prisoner and I went to dig a grave for this mother and her baby boy. We had nearly finished it and I was still in the hole when I heard movement above and a voice yelling at me in German, "hurry up, hurry up". I climbed out and saw . . . and the baby together with two civilian non-Jews and a Gestapo officer, whose name I knew was Heidt. When she saw me and the newly-dug grave, . . . became hysterical and began screaming to me that I should tell the world and her family what was happening. Then the German, Heidt, shot her dead and shot the baby in the neck. He then ordered me to bury them and I started first with . . . because her son was still alive. All the while I was silently reciting Kaddish, the memorial prayer for the dead, for her, but was loath to cover the child while he was still alive and I took my time. This did annoy Heidt and he began to kick the child and stomp him, crying out at him, "you cursed Jew, you don't deserve an-

other bullet, I'll finish you off with my boots". And he did!

This is the first time I have related this story—which is just a part of what happened to me during the 66 months and 7 days I suffered during the Holocaust. I was herded from concentration camp to concentration camp, including the infamous Buchenwald, as well as several slave labor camps, and can recall many more harrowing experiences.

I have occasionally seen . . . sisters, . . . who are still alive and live in . . . New York, and I did see her brother . . . before he passed away two years ago, but I was unable to mention the story of . . . to any of them.

I have such a feeling of guilt, that is why I have been silent for over 40 years. But, hearing you speak on television last week and listening unbelievably to you equate the SS men buried at Bitburg with my fellow Jews who were so horrendously put to death during the Holocaust, pushed me to let you know exactly how I feel. I just cannot be silent any longer, and I suppose I should thank you for your insensitivity which has made me speak up at last.

Mr. President, I regard your office with great admiration and esteem, because I feel that you represent all of the American people. As my President, as President of the thousands of Holocaust survivors and their families who are American citizens, as President of the hundreds of thousands of United States servicemen who imperiled and gave their lives to fight the maniacal Nazi regime, and as President of a freedom-loving, compassionate nation which has, through its social policies given new meaning to the very word "humanity", I sincerely implore you to now rise above political expediency. The cancellation of your plan to visit the cemetery at Bitburg will once again affirm the unique place of the United States of America among all nations in its persistent search for morality, human rights and individual dignity.

Respectfully,

CHARLES FELDMAN.●

ROSALIE CARTWRIGHT  
HONORED

HON. GENE CHAPPIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. CHAPPIE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I am able to honor Mrs. Rosalie Cartwright today. Mrs. Cartwright is a first grade teacher from Durham Elementary School in California, and she will be retiring this year after 35 years of outstanding and dedicated service. Mrs. Cartwright has served as a model to her fellow colleagues, as well as to future teachers.

Mr. Speaker, Rosalie's dedication is exemplified by the long hours she puts in to help a child who may be struggling in school, or the extra time she spends to look for new ways to further challenge her students. If all teachers had the skills, dedication and love for kids that Rosalie has, our country's schools would rank higher than those of any other country. As a result of her outstanding teaching

abilities, Rosalie earned the honor of the 1983 Durham Elementary School Teacher of the Year.

Mrs. Cartwright is well-respected and active in her community. In fact, it was her contributions toward the improvement of Durham, that moved her peers to name her "Woman of the Year" in 1984. Through her contributions she has instilled in her students the need for community service, participation in Government, and education.

Mr. Speaker, it is an understatement to say that Mrs. Rosalie Cartwright's presence will be missed in the halls of Durham Elementary School. I am proud to know, however, that unlike many who have passed through various work places, Rosalie will leave behind her a legacy of love, patriotism, and goodness. Rosalie, through her magical teaching touch, has enriched many lives. Her style and dedication is a challenge to us all.●

## PROVIDING HUMANITARIAN AID FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. FREDERICK C. BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on aid to the Contra forces in Nicaragua, I supported the Barnes-Hamilton proposal, which I believe would have provided the parameters for an effective U.S. policy toward Nicaragua.

The question of aid to the Contras apparently has not been put to rest. It appears that the failure of this body to approve an alternative plan and the untimely visit of Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega to the Soviet Union are causing some Members who earlier opposed the Michel proposal for direct aid to the Contras to rethink their positions. While I share the dismay of many of my colleagues about Mr. Ortega's Moscow visit, I am also concerned that we may be led to respond to the visit by adopting a faulty policy of direct support for the Contras.

This Congress has an obligation to protect America's security and to enhance the security of our Latin American allies.

We can ensure that the Nicaraguan revolution is not exported beyond its borders by supporting the promising negotiations of the group of Contradanza nations. This effort is our best hope of promising long-term Central American security in a way that is consistent with U.S. treaty obligations.

As we anticipate another round of debate on direct aid to the Contras, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a statement signed by the executives of eight private and voluntary organizations. This statement

sets forth the generally agreed-upon definition of humanitarian aid and may help to lend greater precision to our continuing discussions.

## A STATEMENT ON THE NATURE OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE BY U.S. PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

As a contribution to the appropriate framing of discussions of humanitarian aid, we as American private and voluntary organizations wish to state our views on the nature of humanitarian assistance and on the safeguards needed to protect its integrity in complex situations.

1. Under the Geneva Conventions, which have come to provide the established international understanding of humanitarian assistance, only civilians and not combatants have a claim on such aid. While there may be difficulty in certain circumstances in distinguishing between the two, providing humanitarian assistance to a military force is a contradiction in terms.

2. The Geneva Conventions recognize the role of third-party governments in assuring the rights of persons to humanitarian aid only in the case of such governments as are recognized as neutral by the parties to a conflict. The difficulties inherent in conflict situations have created problems for individual governments seeking to provide aid bilaterally and have resulted in greater reliance on the International Committee of the Red Cross and other impartial intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations whose activities are also recognized by the Conventions.

Such organizations are required by the Conventions to meet the following tests for humanitarian assistance: That the aid be provided strictly on the basis of need; that the aid be offered impartially to both parties; and that the organization provide guarantees of efficacy based on proven experience, independence from parties to the conflict, and recognized authority in the international community.

We believe that, particularly in complex and highly politicized situations, international organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees offer the best hope of delivering assistance in non-political fashion to those in need. Their role needs protection and encouragement.

3. In international custom and convention, therefore, humanitarian aid is fundamentally aid which is provided because people are in need, not to accomplish certain political objectives. It is inconsistent with the nature of humanitarian assistance to condition its provision on achieving a ceasefire or on bringing warring parties to the negotiating table.

4. On many past occasions the U.S. government has provided humanitarian aid to those in need. We hope and expect this long and proud tradition to continue. In situations in which the U.S. government is not accepted as neutral by both parties to a conflict, U.S. bilateral assistance, even if provided exclusively through its disaster, refugee, or development offices, can hardly meet the international test of impartiality.

5. Similarly, American private and voluntary organizations such as ours have provided, and plan to continue to provide, humanitarian assistance as an expression of the concerns of private contributors. In doing so, many of us have used and will continue to use resources provided by governments, including the U.S. government.



Given the difficulties we frequently face in providing humanitarian assistance in highly conflictual situations, governments need to take special care not to compromise the impartiality of private agencies, expatriate or indigenous alike. We would also point out that just because an organization calls itself "private" and is channelling contributions from American citizens to people in other countries, its work does not thereby necessarily qualify as humanitarian.

6. Finally, we support the generous provision of humanitarian assistance by the United States through appropriate channels to refugees wherever they are in need.

Bob Ainsworth, Director, World Vision Relief Organization.

Norman E. Barth, Executive Director, Lutheran World Relief.

Asia A. Bennett, Executive Secretary, American Friends Service Committee.

J. Richard Butler, Executive Director, Interim, Church World Service.

Chris Carter, Africa Program Coordinator, Grassroots International.

W. Eugene Grubbs, Executive Director, Interchurch Medical Assistance, Inc.

Peter Gubser, President, American Near East Refugee Aid, Inc.

John Hammock, Executive Director, Oxfam America.

Alden R. Hickman, Executive Director, Heifer Project International, Inc.

James MacCracken, Executive Director, Christian Children's Fund, Inc.

Theodore Wilde, Executive Director, Board of World Mission of the Moravian Church.

#### QUOTA CLUB OF CORNING-PAINTED POST, NY, ASSISTS HEARING IMPAIRED

#### HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today, I have the honor of announcing a special occasion in my district. The Quota Club of Corning-Painted Post, NY, a nonprofit service organization of business and professional women, is spreading out across its own local district to raise money for the hearing impaired. The International Quota Club has proclaimed this week "Shatter Silence" week and made a concerted effort to raise our consciousness and understanding about those who suffer from deafness, hearing difficulties and speech impairments.

We in Congress can learn a valuable lesson from this group's efforts because they do not merely seek to remind us of those disadvantaged by hearing impairments, but also try to educate us about the problems that these fellow Americans must face daily. In a time when we are constantly thinking about budget numbers, it is also important to remember the implications of these numbers. I hope we all make an effort to better understand the implications of our rhetoric. I commend the local Quota Club for their diligent efforts:

QUOTA CLUB OF  
CORNING-PAINTED POST,  
April 17, 1985.

Representative STANLEY N. LUNDINE,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LUNDINE: Again this year we would like your support in proclaiming "Shatter Silence" week, May 6-12th for the Quota Club of Corning-Painted Post.

As you are aware, Quota is a non-profit service organization of business and professional women dedicated to the service of the hearing and speech impaired. Through "Shatter Silence" week we hope to create an understanding of deafness and hearing and speech impaired through our activities.

This is a world wide appeal through International Quota Clubs to raise funds for the hearing impaired. We are making a concentrated effort on May 9th. We will be located in various areas for contributions, all to be donated to the hearing impaired through our District 17.

We would appreciate your support in proclaiming the week of May 6-12th as "Shatter Silence" week and helping us to truly Shatter Silence.

Thank you in the name of Quota.

Sincerely,

JOSEPHINE WARREN,  
Shatter Silence Chairman.●

#### WE SHOULD ENACT H.R. 445, TO PERFORM THE PRICE-ANDERSON ACT

#### HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, this year the Congress must address the issue of what reforms are necessary in the Price-Anderson Act. I am very pleased that the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has scheduled hearings on this important issue for the first week of June.

First enacted in 1957 when the nuclear industry was in its infancy, the Price-Anderson Act placed a temporary \$560 million limit on total liability for an accident occurring at a nuclear powerplant or during the transportation of nuclear materials, regardless of the number of people injured or the severity of the injuries or property damage. As more nuclear plants have become operational, the limit has increased to \$620 million.

However, this temporary limit is still on the books after 25 years of inflation, and despite the fact that the industry is now mature. If the Three Mile Island accident had been more serious, the Federal Insurance Administration has estimated that property loss alone could have come to \$17 billion. The Price-Anderson Act probably would have prevented many people from recovering more than a few pennies on the dollar for their damages.

Uncertainties remain about the chances of a major accident occurring at a nuclear powerplant. But it is certain that in the case of a major nuclear

accident, the Price-Anderson Act forces the public to bear the burden of paying for whatever damages go beyond the arbitrary \$620 million liability limit. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 445, which would remove this outdated limit on liability. Removing this limit would improve safety consciousness in the nuclear industry, and it would help provide adequate compensation to victims of a nuclear accident. I think that the following letter to the editor of the New York Times expresses the concerns of the public that reform of the Price-Anderson Act is absolutely necessary this year.

#### NUCLEAR INDUSTRY ACCOUNTABILITY

To the Editor:

More than 25 years after the first commercial nuclear power plant began generating electricity, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission still can't determine with certainty the chances of a meltdown ("By 2005, Nuclear Unit Sees 50-50 Chance of Meltdown," news article, April 17). One commission estimate states that over 20 years, the crude probability of such an accident is 45 percent, yet one commissioner estimates the risk between 6 percent and 99 percent.

The consequences of severe accidents also remain uncertain. Many analyses predict that some accidents could result in little or no release of radiation, while others could result in hundreds of billions of dollars in personal injury and property damage. Although the nuclear industry contends that the health effects of nuclear accidents are overstated, a recent study by a panel of scientists ("Scientists Question Studies on Nuclear Accidents," Feb. 24) concluded that several more years of review are necessary before estimates can be reduced for how much radiation would be released in a nuclear accident.

In the midst of this uncertainty, one point is clear. The public, not the nuclear industry, bears the burden of these risks. If an accident releasing large amounts of radiation occurs, damages suffered by victims of the nuclear accident could go uncompensated. Under the Price-Anderson Act, the nuclear industry is responsible for only about \$620 million in damages. The financial consequences of a catastrophic accident at Indian Point 3, 25 miles north of New York City, have been estimated by a Government study at more than \$300 billion.

No one, not even the Federal Government, is required to provide a single penny beyond the Price-Anderson limit. The Price-Anderson Act leaves the public unprotected and subsidizes the nuclear industry by shielding it from responsibility for its actions.

This year, Congress will consider the renewal of the Price-Anderson Act—which expires in 1987. The real questions should not be when, or how often, serious nuclear accidents will occur. Rather, Congress should be asking how to prevent these accidents, and if they do occur, how to compensate victims for damage to life and property.

Removing the Price-Anderson Act liability limits would both increase safety incentives and help insure public compensation. It is time that the burden of the risks and uncer-

tainties be shifted off the backs of individual citizens and onto the nuclear industry.

KATHLEEN WELCH,  
Consumer Lobbyist,  
U.S. Public Interest Research Group.●

### KEN BRAUN: A FRIEND AND A LEADER

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, one of America's greatest strengths is its allegiance to the rule of law—law that is made by and for the people.

Our respect for the law is, to a large degree, engendered by the men and women who enforce it. We know what can happen to a country where the enforcers of the law exceed reasonable limits and punish the citizenry with excesses of every kind.

Yet, where there is respect of law by those who administer it, a society becomes not only well protected but ever appreciative of the law and those who are bound to uphold it.

Erie County has been truly blessed because for the past 9 years it has had a sheriff who epitomizes the very best in law enforcement. Kenneth Braun began his career in law enforcement 35 years ago. Several months ago, he decided to retire from his current post as Erie County Sheriff at the end of this year.

I have no doubt that there will be many tributes to Ken Braun as he completes his tenure in office—and deservedly so.

His awards, citations, and honors are many and distinguished. This soft spoken gentleman will humbly deny the significance of these designations but everyone in western New York knows better. Ken Braun is and always will be a model by which excellence in law enforcement is measured. He is a Sheriff's Sheriff.

On the occasion of his 35th year in law enforcement, I extend my warmest regards to Ken Braun and his family on behalf of the grateful people of Erie County. We wish him godspeed, and I am honored to call him a friend.●

### JAMES MARKHAM CELEBRATES 30 YEARS IN RADIO

#### HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join with me, family and friends in honoring a truly remarkable man, Mr. James R. Markham. This year marks

the 30th anniversary of Jim's outstanding participation in the radio business.

For the last 4 years, Markham has been doing an exceptional job for Best Communications, Inc. As vice president/general manager for Best, Markham's responsibilities covered four broadcast properties: KWG, Stockton; KWGF, Stockton; KNTF, Ontario; and KCKC, San Bernardino. His administrative expertise and creative management skills have helped to make Best's stations some of the leading stations in the area.

Jim's broadcast career began in 1956 when he worked as chief engineer for WAPL in Appleton/Green Bay, WI. At the same time, young Markham doubled as an air personality. His fascination with radio and the media grew from there. He worked in many radio stations across the country, from Hudson, NY, to Honolulu, HI, before he settled down in the San Bernardino area. In 1964, Jim went to Hong Kong for a year to work as director of engineering for Trans World Media, Inc. There he designed and built studios and installed two 10-kilowatt transmitters in Hong Kong and Macau, Asia.

In 1966, Jim returned to the United States and became an account executive for KMEN in San Bernardino, CA. From that point, Markham's career skyrocketed into administration and management, leading him to his present position at Best and culminating a 30-year involvement in radio.

An active community leader, Jim holds memberships in the San Bernardino Sister City League, the Louisville Foundation for the Arts, the Inland Empire Cultural Foundation, he is the president of the Inland Empire Broadcasters, a board member of the Inland Empire Basketball Officials Association, and in 1977, was chosen Boss of the Year by the American Business Women Association.

As the current general manager for KCKC in San Bernardino, Jim has demonstrated respect and admiration for the station's owner, Jerry Smaltz. Smaltz' foresight in purchasing the station and constructing its new headquarters in the heart of the Inland Empire is to be congratulated.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been filled with pride by the accomplishments of the people of my district. Jim Markham is another example of the kind of dedicated, hard working and professional citizens I represent. I am sure that the people of California's 35th District would agree that James Markham is a caring man, one who deserves to be recognized for his outstanding contributions to his community, his State, and the Nation.●

### CAMBODIA: HUMANITARIAN, NOT MILITARY, AID

#### HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when the House considers H.R. 1555, the foreign aid authorization bill, I plan to offer an amendment to strike section 206 which authorizes military assistance for the non-Communist Cambodian resistance and to substitute instead an authorization for humanitarian aid to the non-Communist Cambodians.

This issue is one of profound philosophical as well as practical implications. All Americans concerned with events in Indochina are sympathetic to the cause of the non-Communist Cambodians. However, it is not enough to conclude a cause is just. An assessment must also be made that U.S. involvement advances just goals. The first premise is met in the proposal by the House Foreign Affairs Committee to provide military aid to the non-Communist Cambodians; the second remains unproven.

Accordingly, in the strongest possible terms I would urge this body to reconsider whether military aid is justified at this time. It is my view that it may prove unconscionably costly in the toll exacted on human lives and from a geostrategic perspective it may prove to be tragically counterproductive. That conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is based on a number of considerations.

First, the need for U.S. military assistance has not been demonstrated to Congress. A recent letter to the House Foreign Affairs Committee from the Department of State reads in part:

It is our understanding that the non-communist resistance is being provided with all the military equipment it can effectively absorb at this time. We do not believe, therefore, that it is necessary or appropriate for the United States to give weapons to the resistance now.

Second, U.S. military aid, no matter how small, will inevitably alter the indigenous character of this resistance movement and elevate it another notch to the level of a superpower confrontation.

Third, it is hard to believe that \$5 million in military-oriented aid will really make a difference in the ability of the resistance to counter the world's third largest army. But while such publicly committed assistance is nowhere near enough to make much of a dent in the struggle, it is clearly more than enough to invest the national reputation and military prestige of the United States in an operation over which we have virtually no control.



Fourth, even the pledge of token U.S. military assistance at this point will raise unrealistic expectations among the resistance forces that the United States is committed to provide ongoing and increasing levels of military aid.

Fifth, and perhaps most tragically, the injection of a U.S. military component into the Cambodian struggle might provoke an unprecedented backlash by the Vietnamese forces against the resistance. U.S. aid could in effect become an invitation to the genocide of the very people with whom we sympathize most. It may also invite Vietnamese aggression against Thailand, through whom, it is proposed we funnel U.S. military aid.

Sixth, ASEAN has taken the lead in this regional conflict and ought to continue to do so. The United States has demonstrated its awareness that it is in our national interest to promote the strength and stability of ASEAN by providing security assistance to various ASEAN member states for their national defense. The United States has no need to prove anything in this regard, and certainly not by reinvolving itself directly in Cambodia.

Seventh, U.S. military aid might hurt—rather than help—the prospects for a negotiated settlement. The Washington Post on April 2, 1985, quoted State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb as saying:

U.S. supply of weapons to the resistance could create difficulties in reaching a negotiated settlement and in sustaining international support for the Cambodian cause by highlighting Cambodia as a U.S.-Vietnam conflict.

We do not need to give Vietnam an even greater rationalization to fight in Cambodia, nor should we happily welcome even the remotest possibility of associating ourselves once again with a failed venture against the Vietnamese Communists.

Eighth, it is ill-advised to provide economic support funds for military use when the policy, now in law, is to bar the use of economic aid for military purposes. It is also a dangerous precedent to provide aid through a third entity—in this case, Thailand—because the United States then loses sovereign control over how such aid is used.

Ninth, it is fantasy to believe the fledgling democratic resistance to the Vietnamese occupation will not be dominated by Pol Pot's forces. Yesterday's war criminals are alive and well in Southeast Asia and despite high-minded desires to the contrary, there is no way at this time for the democratic resistance to avoid complicity with Khmer Rouge atrocities when they are in tactical alliance.

Tenth, there has not been reflected, to my knowledge, any great understanding in the American public that Congress is giving serious consider-

ation to a military—albeit through support of proxy forces—re-involvement in Indochina. I have grave doubts that the public would be enthused about such a policy and if Congress cannot commit the United States to aid of a determinative magnitude for the long haul, caution would seem, the wiser course. It is better to head off an explosive entanglement early than late.

The initiative for the change in U.S. policy regarding military assistance to the Cambodian resistance, presented by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, comes from the subcommittee of jurisdiction, with the initial opposition of the administration. Subsequent to subcommittee and full committee markup, the administration gingerly welcomed the approach of the committee but the language used by the administration reflected obvious misgivings.

It would appear that the committee put the administration in a catch-22. If it failed to give a sympathetic response to this congressional initiative, it might appear that it was undercutting the non-Communist forces. If it acceded to the committee fully, it risked re-involvement in Indochina in ways that neither it nor the public seemed prepared to accept. Hence it chose the language of welcoming the Solarz initiative, but without abandoning its stated concerns about providing military assistance at this time. It was an understandable response but one that neither side in this debate should take as vindication for its policy approach.

While supporters of military assistance would argue that we cannot forever be paralyzed by our experiences in Indochina, skeptics can rightfully suggest that neither should we attempt to assuage our national guilt over our past involvement in Vietnam by embarking on a new military venture without a clear definition of the national interest involved and an equally clear consensus among the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the American public that the proposed course of action is in that interest.

A couple of weeks ago, a conservative administration disregarded the importance of law, domestic as well as international, in pressing Congress to provide military aid to the Nicaraguan Contras. It lost. Now, a liberal Congress may be prepared to disregard history in pressing the Executive to provide military aid to the non-Communist forces in Cambodia. It, too, should lose. ●

MISSISSIPPI FARMER KEEPS VOW TO EDUCATE HIS CHILDREN

## HON. WEBB FRANKLIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Robert Johnson of Hinds County, MS, has set an example that all parents could follow.

Mr. Johnson did not have the opportunity to attend college, but he made it a point to see that all his 14 children went. Mr. Johnson and his late wife sacrificed a great deal to see that all their children would have the opportunity to get an education. Last year, he saw his dream come true as his youngest son, Nathaniel, received his degree from Alcorn State University.

The Johnson family is quite a success story, and their story was recently recorded in *Ebony* magazine. I am pleased to have this opportunity to share it with my colleagues:

MISSISSIPPI FARMER KEEPS VOW TO EDUCATE HIS CHILDREN—FAMILY DISCIPLINE WAS THE KEY TO A BETTER LIFE

No one ever had to tell Robert Johnson Sr., anything more than once. Even as a young husband and father trying to bring up a family in dirt-poor Mississippi, he knew right from the start that he didn't want to work at the local sawmill. It was hard, bone-crunching work and the pay was poor and the hours long. Still, he did it. After all, Robert Johnson had a growing family to feed and educate and clothe. But he had an independent streak about him, too, and more than anything else he wanted to be his own man. The only way he knew to do that was to farm the land his grandfather had divided among his three sons. A piece of the land was passed on to Johnson and over the years he had added to it. By Mississippi standards, the land was nothing to snicker at—175 acres between Bolton and Edwards near the Champion Hill Civil War battlefield—yet it was nothing to stagger the imagination either. But it was Johnson's land—free and clear. On it he would grow cotton, his money crop; sweet potatoes and peas for canning, and corn to feed the livestock. And he would be his own man and have the wherewithal to educate his children. That was important. Still, it was a chancy proposition at best, particularly for the small, independent Black farmer trying to survive in Mississippi's hostile racial climate of the 1930s and 1940s.

Robert Johnson looked evenly at the odds and made himself a promise—that none of his children, not one, would ever have to eke out a living from Mississippi dirt. Johnson and his wife, Ella Lorean Marshall, both strong, proud people, made a pact with each other which was no less curious than the two steel wills behind it—to send each of their children to college, no matter the personal sacrifice. Mrs. Johnson saw all but three of her 14 children graduate from college. She died in 1976 at age 58. And so the task fell to her husband Robert to do the witnessing for both of them. Last year, when Johnson, stooped and up in years, his hair now completely white, saw 22-year-old

Nathaniel receive his degree from Alcorn State University (the college where all but one of the Johnson brothers and sisters received their degrees) a dream had come true and Robert Johnson had lived to see it. He was 77 years old. The old man still farms, but now he doesn't have the same desire to work the land that he once had. "Now I can grow as much cotton as I want to, but I ain't got nobody to do it with. She's gone."

Education was a powerful motivator in the Johnson household. "We wanted to send the children to college to get them out from under the foot of others," Johnson says today. "We wanted them to stand on their own two feet."

None of this is to suggest, however, that Robert Johnson did it all himself. The truth is that he will be the first to tell you he had help—a lot of help. First, the children helped, all 14 of them, whose ages range from 22 to 50. "After college, I remained home," says Robert Jr., 45, a math teacher and assistant principal at Utica High School in Utica, Miss. "We had the task of seeing the other family members get an education. It was a team effort."

He recalls the time his mother had to sell her favorite cow, "O'Proudy" (the mother would always say how proud she was to own the cow), which had been given to her by her father a wedding present, to raise money for Robert Jr.'s first-year tuition at Alcorn State. The cow had been in the family 24 years. "My parents told me to take the money, pay my tuition and then to make the best of it," Robert Jr. remembers.

The children, for the most part, all worked while going to college, although in recent years the family made greater use of college loan and college grant packages.

There was special help, too. "I kept a switch in the corner and used it whenever there was a need to," Robert Sr., says. "I wasn't a mean parent, just strict."

The little white frame house that sits high atop a knoll between Bolton and Edwards was always abuzz with the shrieks and the excitement and the laughter of children growing up. And if the work became too hard, or the mules pulled too far, the children had only to look at their parents, who worked twice as hard and twice as long as any of them, to dash any thoughts of complaining about doing too much. It was a tough discipline, but the children learned well.

Others would see it, too, the Johnson discipline, and the way the Johnsons children went about their college studies and then on about their lives. "To me, what stands out was that they were always studious," says Dr. Walter Washington, president of Alcorn State University and a former president of Utica Junior College, where all 10 Johnson brothers and four Johnson sisters attended. Thirteen later transferred to Alcorn State, the oldest historically Black land grant college in the nation (established in 1871), and one, Henry, the oldest son, transferred to Mississippi Valley State University. "They were good college citizens," the president continues, "always polite. There was never any disciplinary problem. And I don't remember any of them ever being out of school. They attended school every day. And I would see the father every time at every event the institution had." And for many years Mrs. Johnson was president of the local school P.T.A.

Education was always important to Robert Johnson, and it is not hard to understand why. He had excellent role models—his father and two uncles attended Alcorn

State and his mother was a graduate of Tougaloo. When time came for Johnson himself to go to college, the opportunities just weren't there. "There was no high school for Blacks in Hinds County then," he explains. "Man, I had a time. But, I said, if I couldn't go to college I was going to walk proud; I was going to send my kids through school."

That, he did. "I remember when it was time for the two oldest girls [Marilyn and Earlean] to go to school," says son Bernard, 34, the postmaster at Alcorn State. "The girls needed money and papa went to the bank to get the money to send the girls to school. The banker asked papa, 'Robert, why don't you send them girls up north somewhere. They ain't got no business with an education.' Papa was mad. So we did a lot of extra work, picked peanuts and chopped cotton, because papa was determined to see those girls through school."

Robert Johnson was determined to see all 14 of his children through school. First, there were the two oldest girls, Earlean, 47, and Marilyn Lynn, 48. Both graduated from Alcorn State in 1959. Henry, the oldest boy, stayed back to help with the farm. When it was his time to go, after seeing most of his brothers and sisters through, he chose Mississippi Valley State, graduating in 1980. Today, he teaches industrial arts in Inverness, Miss. Earlean went on to get her master's in English from Tennessee State University and is now teaching in the Leighton (Ala.) Public School System. Marilyn got her master's from North Carolina A&T State University in Early Childhood Education and is an elementary school teacher in Indianola, Miss.

Robert Jr., graduated from Alcorn State the year after Marilyn and Earlean finished and later received a master's from Indiana University in education administration. Today, he teaches math and is an assistant principal at Utica High School in Utica. Two years after Robert Jr., graduated came Walter, 43, who now has a master's from Mississippi State University and teaches biology in Kosciusko, Miss. Emanuel graduated from Alcorn State in 1964, received his master's and Ph.D. from North Carolina State University, and works for the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture. R.C., 40, finished Alcorn State in 1965, and went on to earn both his master's and Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. He is currently an assistant principal at a junior high school in Minneapolis. Next out of Alcorn State was W.C., 38, who graduated in 1968, and would later receive a master's from Indiana State University. He is now working toward his doctorate's at the University of Minnesota in industrial planning.

Two years after W.C. graduated from Alcorn State, H.C., 36, finished. Today, he is working toward a Ph.D. in industrial arts education at the University of Southern Mississippi. Thirty-four-year-old Bernard finished Alcorn State in 1972, got a master's in education administration, and then returned to Alcorn as the college's postmaster. Mary, 32, graduated from Alcorn State in 1974, and Evelyn, 30, came out two years later. Today, Mary, with a master's from the University of Minnesota and another from Alcorn State, is a contract specialist with the Dept. of the Navy. Evelyn, who stayed at Alcorn State to get a master's in agronomy, is now an underwriter with the Federal Crop Insurance. In 1978, Carl came out of Alcorn State and four years later he received a master's from the University of Maryland. He is currently working for Gen-

eral Electric in Schenectady, N.Y. Nathaniel, the baby of the family, graduated from Alcorn State in 1983 and is working on a master's in agronomy at the University of Maryland.

"Mostly we managed by just working hard," says Robert Johnson Sr. "And I've kept my faith in God. He'll bless you. God blesses His people. We raised 14 children and none was ever sick. If I ain't been blessed, ain't nobody ever been blessed." ●

## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to praise the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA). I am pleased to join my colleagues in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the REA, established by President Franklin Roosevelt on May 11, 1935.

When the REA was established in 1935, only 6 out of every 100 Pennsylvania farms received electric service. Today, there are 13 rural cooperatives in Pennsylvania and virtually every corner of the Nation enjoys electric service, largely because of the work of the REA. In Pennsylvania, electric service has been extended to 99 percent of the Commonwealth's farms, where rural electric co-ops serve over 600,000 consumers.

My 22d Congressional District, a predominantly rural region, is located in the southwestern corner of Pennsylvania. The presence of electricity made our rural area more attractive to business and industry, and helped stem the migration of young people to the city. The absence of electricity had kept rural economies tied almost exclusively to agriculture. Factories and businesses naturally preferred to locate in cities where electric power was available. If a rural person wanted more money than farming offered, he had no choice but to move to the city to locate other employment.

Today, like yesteryear, the rural electric co-ops are involved in their communities, helping with economic development and encouraging important services from transportation to health care. I commend this group of rural electric pioneers for their past and present dedication to a better quality of life for rural people. Thank you for your 50 years of service. ●



## FUELING THE U.S. ECONOMY

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, as the debate and discussion preceding the second White House Conference on Small Business scheduled for August 1986 take place, it is important to consider the conference agenda from a number of perspectives.

One such perspective is presented by Virginia Littlejohn, executive director of the Professional Services Council, Washington, DC, and president of the National Association of Women Business Owners, in a recent article in *Inc.* magazine.

Ms. Littlejohn suggests that the conference should focus on "a growth agenda" that emphasizes market forces and incentives, thus leading to fueling the U.S. economy for the rest of this century and beyond.

She outlines an approach that would link specific Federal policies to critical national strategic goals. What is needed, Ms. Littlejohn asserts, is consensus on "overarching strategic objectives," rather than a "laundry list" of tactical recommendations.

Her thoughtful, stimulating comments are worthy of consideration by planners of the conference and those Members of Congress concerned with small business and the role it plays in the American economy.

## THE SECOND WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

(By Virginia Littlejohn)

At the second White House Conference on Small Business, which is planned for August of next year in Washington, DC, we in the entrepreneurial community can stake out a dynamic growth agenda that will fuel this country's economy for the rest of this century and into the next. Or we can complain about this or that injustice, carp about this or that regulation, and fight for more federal handouts.

It all depends on how we answer one question: Is the conference about smallness, or is it about growth?

A conference focused on smallness would worry about the future of the Small Business Administration loan program, about how to define "small," and about bigger procurement set-asides for small business.

A conference devoted to a growth agenda, on the other hand, would emphasize market forces and incentives. It would seek to link specific tax, grant, and procurement policies to such national strategic goals as technological innovation, managerial ingenuity, productivity, job creation, industrial competitiveness, increased trade, and greater economic opportunity. Conversely, it would avoid further tinkering with programs that foster a business-welfare mentality and that treat the entrepreneurial sector as just another special interest rather than as a powerful engine of growth.

To formulate such an aggressive agenda, however, we will have to change the way we think. Five years ago, delegates to the first White House Conference on Small Business, myself included, formulated a laundry list

of 60 tactical recommendations, many of which arose from narrow small-business themes, such as providing special consideration to veterans in business.

At the next White House Conference, we need to do more than draw up another laundry list. We need to think strategically about the future and its opportunities.

Establishing a consensus on overarching strategic objectives—and developing both an annual and a longer-range plan to achieve them—would give the entrepreneurial sector a strong and coherent voice in national debates over, for example, tax, foreign trade, and economic policies. This is the sort of influence we have never had before—because, divided and cacophonous, small-business factions have, in the past, effectively canceled out each other's lobbying efforts.

This strategy of consensus will require courage on the part of the small business associations. Each of them—the National Federation of Independent Business, National Small Business Association, National Association of Women Business Owners, Small Business United, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and others—will have to sacrifice some of its own pet issues for the larger goal. The strategy will demand self-discipline on the part of the individuals who help shape the conference agenda in the state meetings scheduled to take place during the next 18 months, and on the part of the conference delegates themselves.

All the parties involved will need some criteria by which to separate the narrow from the broad, the trivial from the significant. They will need to ask themselves:

Does this policy proposal meet the needs of the entrepreneurial sector? Does it foster economic growth? Will it encourage job creation, risk-taking, innovation, competition, more international trade, and enhanced industrial competitiveness?

Does it rely on incentives rather than regulations, carrots rather than sticks?

Does it mean more federal spending? If so, is there a substantial return on that investment?

Proposals that encourage smallness for its own sake, that discourage growth or emphasize regulations, that reward inefficiency and dependency, or that are too costly would be thrown out. Those that pass muster would become our national agenda for entrepreneurship and economic growth.

Concentrating on a few items of overriding strategic value, rather than on our usual plethora of issues, will enable the entrepreneurial sector not only to shape the public-policy debate, but to be far more effective in getting its agenda enacted as well.

Likewise, Congress should be urged to think in strategic terms. Our challenge is to educate policymakers to the fact that risk, entrepreneurship, innovation, and growth are not liberal or conservative issues; rather, they represent an urgent national priority that Congress must address if we are to maintain our industrial competitiveness, create jobs, and expand economic opportunity.

The 1980 White House Conference on Small Business developed visibility for small business issues, provided a grassroots education for a large number of people who had never before been involved in shaping public policy, and stimulated a wave of reform measures in Congress. The second White House Conference should aim to do more than just repeat the accomplishments of the first. It should embolden Congress to elevate risk, innovation, entrepreneurship, and growth to the status of national policies

that propel the American economy into the twenty-first century. ●

## MOST DANGEROUS BILL OF THE YEAR

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, in Tuesday's Dallas Times Herald, James Kilpatrick, a respected columnist, wrote about H.R. 700. I want to share this wisdom with my colleagues.

[From Dallas Times Herald, May 7, 1985]

## MOST DANGEROUS BILL OF THE YEAR

(By James Kilpatrick)

Very soon now, the House of Representatives will take up the most dangerous bill of the year. If last year's precedent is any guide to this year's action, the House will whoop its approval. The bill is the marvelously named "Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985."

That title is truly marvelous, is it not? It was devised by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and we can imagine the knee-slapping and the cries of "Hoo, boy!" that arose with this delightful invention. The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985! Who could vote against it?

Well, if the principle of federalism still has meaning, if separation is to be maintained between the public and private sectors of American life, if the heavy hand of federal regulation is not to be laid upon the whole of our society, members of Congress had better vote against this devious and deceptive little sleeper.

Let me explain. In 1972 Congress passed a law prohibiting sexual discrimination in "any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." In 1984 the Supreme Court considered a case involving Grove City College in Pennsylvania. The college did not discriminate against anyone; it accepted no direct federal aid; but it did enroll students who had received federal grants.

The Grove City case presented two questions: (1) By accepting students who received federal aid, was the college itself a recipient of federal aid? (2) If so, would anti-discrimination provisions of the 1972 act apply throughout the entire institution?

The high court said yes to (1) and no to (2). It held that the grants received by many Grove City students did not trigger "institution-wide coverage." The grant affected only the college's program of financial aid. The court's program of financial aid. The court's opinion set off an uproar among civil rights activists who yearned for a broader reading, and it led to the introduction last year of a bill to overturn the court's decision not only as the 1972 education act but as the opinion might affect three other civil rights acts as well. The bill roared through the House 370-32 but died in the Senate.

Now the bill is back. It is cosmetically disguised with fresh lipstick and an innocent wig. It wears this darling new title. It is being sold by its sponsors—chiefly Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., and Rep. Augustus Hawkins, D-Calif.—as just a little harmless measure that no friend of civil rights could oppose. The many sponsors do not ac-

knowledge—perhaps they do not even know—the drastic reach of the bill to which they have given their names.

The bill is a trickier. Its ostensible purpose is merely to define what is meant by "program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." It says that for the purpose of enforcing civil rights laws, the term applies to "all of the operations" of various "entities."

Thus, if "any part" of a state or local government receives federal aid, every part becomes subject to the entire panoply of enforcement procedures. The bill would embrace "all the operations of a corporation, partnership, or other private organization." It would spread its net over every classroom in the nation. Its enforcement would demand whole armies of federal inspectors and bureaucrats to review compliance reports.

The bill contains a slippery clause that slides easily past the eye. The bill's purpose is to restore the interpretation of the several civil rights acts "as previously administered." The effect of that sly little provision is to write into statutory law thousands of regulations contrived by the bureaucracy over the past 20 years. These interpretations, once validated by the pending bill, would be greatly strengthened and broadened. Utah's Sen. Orrin Hatch, who led the battle against the 1984 bill, says the 1985 version is "even worse." He is absolutely right.

The bill is not a bill "to restore" anybody's civil rights, for no civil rights were taken away by the Grove City case. It is a bill to expand federal power into every aspect of our public and private life.●

**PENNSYLVANIA AMERICAN  
LEGION AUXILIARY HONORS  
NATIONAL PRESIDENT HELEN  
ADAMS GARDNER**

**HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 22, the Department of Pennsylvania in the American Legion Auxiliary will honor their national president, Mrs. Helen Adams Gardner.

Mrs. Gardner was the 64th person elected to the post of national president for the auxiliary last September. At that time she emphasized her goal of bringing national attention to the issue of adult illiteracy in our country. She also stressed the importance of teaching reading and writing fundamentals to our students. Her theme in this regard is "Invest in America."

It appears that Mrs. Gardner's theme for herself has always been "Invest in America." She has invested her time and effort to many causes in her work with the auxiliary, as well as in hospital, church, and community affairs. Certainly the investments of her time have benefited many Americans, and we express our gratitude for her hard work.

It was in 1955 that Mrs. Gardner first joined the auxiliary, and she

began her tenure in a leadership position as the charter president of Greenacres City Unit No. 258. She has been the chairperson of several committees, and was leadership development chairman in 1969-70. Before her election last September, she served as national vice president. As we have come to see, this woman has been in the forefront of developing the American Legion Auxiliary into what it is today.

As mentioned earlier, this energetic woman has also been deeply involved in hospital work, as she recently retired as assistant director of nursing at John F. Kennedy Memorial Hospital in Atlantis, FL. Her work now will be devoted to auxiliary work, and for that I know the Department of Pennsylvania is thankful. The national presidency is indeed in capable hands.●

**REA—A PENNSYLVANIA SUCCESS  
STORY**

**HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I engaged in a colloquy with my friend and colleague from Missouri on the importance of explaining the national benefits of REA's work to Members from urban districts. All of the Nation, urban, rural, and suburban alike benefits from universal telephone and electric service.

Today, as REA enters its second half century of service to our Nation, I'd like to highlight the benefits that REA has brought to my district in northeastern Pennsylvania.

It is difficult to imagine a life without electricity. But only 50 years ago, less than 10 percent of all Americans did not enjoy the many benefits that electricity provides. The private power companies that served the cities and towns did not find it technically possible or economically feasible to run lines into the country. "The countryside is too rugged and too sparsely populated to run electric lines," they said. They added, "even if we did run lines, the farmers would not use enough electricity to make the investment pay for itself."

The people who wanted electricity—who needed electricity—knew, however, that, if they worked together, they could get electric service. They decided to form their own electric utilities and to organize them as nonprofit, consumer-owned cooperatives. They were very familiar with the cooperative form of doing business. For decades, they had purchased seed and equipment from supply cooperatives and had sold the fruits of their labors through marketing cooperatives. They knew that, by joining together in cooperatives, they could bring the

weight of their collective strength to bear on the problems that faced them. They knew that cooperatives could provide them with strength beyond their numbers.

Although the Rural Electrification Administration had been established by FDR on May 11, 1935, it took a while for news about the new Federal program to spread and for local community groups to get organized. In my district, the Sullivan County Rural Electric Cooperative had its first REA loan approved on October 3, 1936, and the first line was organized more than a year later in December 1937. It is interesting to note that Sullivan County REC was 1 of only 2 of Pennsylvania's 15 rural electric cooperatives to have a college-educated manager. In most cases, a local resident or member of the construction crew that built the cooperative's first lines was chosen to be its manager.

The conditions Sullivan County Rural Electric Cooperative had to deal with when it was established and, indeed, continues to deal with, highlight the need for the Rural Electrification Administration.

The area Sullivan serves is extremely remote and rugged. The area is known as Pennsylvania's Endless Mountains, and includes World's End State Park. That gives you an idea of what the countryside is like there. Sullivan's service territory includes dairy farms nestled in the valleys and sawmills that process the stands of large native hardwoods. If it were not for the financing programs of the Rural Electrification Administration, I believe it's fair to say that there might still today be some areas of Sullivan County without electric service.

Another situation that creates problems for Sullivan County REC is the fact that about half of its members are seasonal. By and large, they are city people who own summer homes and hunting camps so that they can enjoy nature's bounty in this beautiful area. Despite the fact that seasonal members' dwellings are not their full-time residences, they expect to have electricity available when they flip the switch. It is not uncommon to see a single phase distribution line stretch for miles down an isolated mountain road serving only a few consumers. But the cooperative is dedicated to the concept of area coverage, providing electric service to everyone who wants it and at uniform rates.

Rural electric cooperatives, with the help of the Rural Electrification Administration, have done much to change the face of rural America. They have increased the standard of living of all rural people and have vastly increased the productivity of American farmers so that they today feed our Nation and help feed a hungry world. We all owe a debt of



gratitude to America's rural electric cooperatives for the work they have done and for their willingness to stand ready to meet the challenges of the future.●

# ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION

**HON. JOSEPH J. DiGUARDI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 9, 1985*

● Mr. DiGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise before this body today to celebrate 100 years of Ukrainian immigration to the United States.

The Ukrainian people have made great contributions to business, to the arts and culture, and to the religious heritage of our Nation.

As we honor the sons and daughters of the Ukraine, let us not forget that the homeland of their ancestors remains under the grip of Soviet tyranny.

I am honored to represent an area that has many Ukrainian-American families. In particular, the city of Yonkers is an area where Americans of Ukrainian descent have enriched our lives. From my friends there, I have learned a great deal, not only about the culture of Ukrainian-Americans, but also of the suffering they have endured in their quest for freedom.

The Ukrainian people have found America to be a land where they can fulfill their dreams, worship as they please, and participate in a representative democracy. In the old country, the Ukrainian people enjoyed these freedoms, but only for a few short years after the independence of their nation on January 22, 1918. Then came the invasion by the Soviet Red army followed by actions of the Stalin dictatorship to collectivize the agricultural regions of the Ukraine. A massive famine in the Ukrainian nation was the result of this policy. As the famine ended, the Ukrainian people were subjected to a litany of horrors; the horrors of armies marching through their homeland and the horrors of the Nazi occupation. After the conclusion of World War II, the Soviet dictators tried repeatedly to quash the national spirit of the Ukrainian people.

In the Ukraine today, the Soviet invaders have outlawed the practice of religion. They have outlawed the right of the Ukrainian people to speak their native tongue in their classrooms. They have sought to destroy the Ukrainian nation, but the Ukrainian people fight on. Their dreams of freedom, while a reality in America, cannot be destroyed by the tyranny of the Soviet dictatorship.

I join with my friends of Ukrainian ancestry to share that dream. I know

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

one day that dream will come true. The Ukraine will live again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

### IT WAS NOT "MORALLY RIGHT" MR. PRESIDENT

**HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 9, 1985*

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, we shared a sense of sadness that President Reagan went through with his decision to visit the cemetery at Bitburg. It was wrong, morally wrong.

Congress knew it was wrong. We told him so in letters and telegrams and resolutions. In fact, both the House and the Senate passed resolutions by overwhelming margins urging that this visit not be made.

The American people knew it was wrong. But the voice of American veterans and Holocaust survivors and many other good Americans were not heard by President Reagan.

That is why Sunday was a day of sadness.

The presence of the President of the United States at the gravesites of Nazi SS soldiers speaks louder than any words President Reagan might say as explanation.

That visit defamed the honor of our veterans who fought and died against Nazi tyranny to bring freedom to the world. It disgraced the memory of the millions of Holocaust victims by honoring their murderers.

That is why Sunday was a day of sadness.

President Reagan's visit to Bitburg was designed to be a symbol or reconciliation; it was a symbol, but not of reconciliation. There can be no reconciliation with the genocide of the death camps. There can never be reconciliation with the evil that was manifested by the Nazi SS. Instead of being a symbol of reconciliation, President Reagan's visit was a symbol of insensitivity, pain, and sadness.

What makes the visit to the cemetery at Bitburg even more striking is that a symbol of reconciliation could have been easily achieved without the anguish that characterized the President's chosen action. The appropriate symbolism required to show reconciliation between two democratic allies would have been a Presidential visit to a site manifesting democratic ideals. Many possibilities were available, including the gravesite of Konrad Adenauer whom many consider the father of modern democratic West Germany, but the possibilities were all ignored. Adenauer's gravesite was added as an afterthought but not as a replacement for Bitburg.

That is why Sunday was a day of sadness.

*May 9, 1985*

As the son of a World War II veteran, I was appalled that President Reagan would choose to bring honor to the very enemy my father fought 40 years ago. Fortunately, my father returned home from the war, but 405,399 other fathers, brothers, and husbands did not. More than 19,000 American soldiers lost their lives in the Battle of the Bulge, but the President chose to lay a wreath at the cemetery where Nazi soldiers they fought are buried. Was the President so certain that not one of the Nazi SS soldiers buried at Bitburg had taken part in the massacre of bound American POW's at Malmédy?

In planning the visit to West Germany, the President announced that he would lay a wreath at the cemetery in Bitburg, but that he would not visit the site of a concentration camp because it would "reawaken memories" of the Holocaust. Later, Bergen-Belsen was added to the itinerary. The presence of the American President at Bergen-Belsen is a very important symbol of remembrance. Its importance should not have been diminished by using Bergen-Belsen to balance the stop at Bitburg.

The President made the situation even more painful by equating, as victims of Nazi tyranny, the German soldiers buried at Bitburg with the millions who were murdered in the death camps. I was outraged by this breach of President Reagan's moral responsibility as the leader of the free world and immediately sent him a telegram to tell him so.

I have been to Yad Vashem—the Holocaust memorial in Israel—and participated a few weeks ago in the Yom Hashoa memorial service for the 6 million—which included the Inaugural American Gathering of Holocaust Survivors—in Philadelphia. These experiences reinforced my belief that the balancing of Nazis and their victims, or of Bitburg and Bergen-Belsen, is a moral impossibility. Remembrance was the only reason to go to Bergen-Belsen, and was the reason not to go to Bitburg.

That is why Sunday was a day of sadness.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the President's decision will not pass merely because the event is over. The hurt is very deep and the sadness will not go away.●

## SACRAMENTO CHAMBER VISITS HILL

**HON. VIC FAZIO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 9, 1985*

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this week marks a milestone in the history of the Sacramento Metropolitan Cham-

ber of Commerce. One hundred and thirty-two volunteer lobbyists from the greater Sacramento region devoted 3 grueling days to furthering our shared goal of educating Capitol Hill and the administration about the needs and hopes of our community.

This visit marks the 15th year of this important and valuable venture. In its 15-year history, this trip has grown from five chamber members and one topic to the scores of activists and dozens of topics that comprise it today. On this trip, 15 separate teams kept 110 appointments to discuss 77 subjects. The topics ranged from military matters to the arts.

The chamber of commerce and the community leaders here this week represent the finest tradition in democratic governance. I know of no community in this great Nation that surpasses in diligence and commitment the citizenry represented by this delegation. Sacramento's wisdom in sending this group to Washington is evidenced by the positive response they receive. This annual event is one that has served our community well and I trust it will continue to do so far into the future.●

#### CUYAHOGA VALLEY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw Members attention to a recent article by David B. Cooper in the Akron Beacon Journal about the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, a beautiful park in Ohio which Congress created and which is currently celebrating the 10th anniversary of its formal dedication by the National Park Service.

In his article, Mr. Cooper eloquently describes the history of the park and some of the many natural and historic treasures of the Cuyahoga Valley itself.

Last year, according to National Park Service figures, an estimated 900,000 people visited the park, and this does not include attendance at other State or local parks or privately run recreation facilities—such as the Blossom Music Center, Hale Farm and Homestead, Brandywine or Boston Mills ski areas—which are located within the park boundaries. From my own calculations, adding in these and other sites within the park, the Cuyahoga Valley attracts between 5 and 6 million visitors each year.

As Mr. Cooper notes, the park has been planned and organized well by the National Park Service. And he gives appropriate credit to Lewis Albert, the Park Service superinten-

dant of the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area under whose able leadership the park has flourished in recent years.

Although Mr. Cooper kindly gives credit to me and our colleague, Mr. REGULA, for our efforts on behalf of the park, I would like to note that several others also deserve much credit, including our current Senators GLENN and METZENBAUM, former Senator Taft and former Representative Charles Vanik, to name a few. The park was and still is a bipartisan effort in the Congress.

Clearly, the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area serves not only present generations but future ones as well. Mr. Cooper states it thoughtfully:

In 2075, as the Cuyahoga Valley Park is nearing its 100th anniversary, its creation will be thought of universally as one of the wisest and most enduring decisions made by this region. In the meantime, it is a place of beauty to visit often, a place in which to refresh the body and soul and to enjoy the richness of the land.

Mr. Speaker, following my remarks at this point I would like to insert the full text of Mr. Cooper's excellent article.

#### THE BEAUTIFUL VALLEY BECKONS

(By David B. Cooper)

We walked through the whispering wonder of the woods, enjoying a beautiful day and the marvels of spring bursting forth from every limb and bush.

We had taken the Boston Run Trail, just off route 303, across from the Happy Days Visitor Center in the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area.

It is a gentle, interesting trail that makes you puff only a time or two. Boston Run takes the walker, jogger or cross-country skier on a flattened circle of a route 2.5 miles long, according to the map provided by the National Park Service.

Our walk—it could hardly be called a hike—made us thankful once again for the Cuyahoga Valley Park, which strikes me as one of the rich treasures of Northeast Ohio.

We lived almost 10 years in the Detroit metropolitan area before moving to Akron in 1977. We liked Detroit, but something we missed greatly there was the ability to get out into the country. Michigan is a beautiful state in many ways, but the land for miles around Detroit is flat. You have to go almost halfway upstate before you really get to woods and streams, valleys and hills.

In Northeast Ohio, we're about to enter the 10th year of the operation of "The Park," as it is called by almost everyone who does not want to deal with its longer name or acronym, CVNRA.

June 26, 1975, was the date on which the park was officially established and began operations under the aegis of the National Park Service.

President Gerald Ford had signed the congressional act creating the park on Dec. 27, 1974, six months earlier.

Last year, the Park Service has said, about 900,000 people visited the Cuyahoga Valley—not counting all those who came through to go to Blossom Music Center, Hale Farm and Homestead, or to golf, or to ski at Brandywine or Boston Mills.

As we headed home from our weekend visit, we saw joggers and hikers and bikers and people just out for a picnic.

It is an unusual park, as parks go, because it exists both for enjoyment and for preservation of the landscape, the valley, the Cuyahoga River, and the remnants of the Ohio and Erie Canal. It is not Yosemite or Yellowstone, with squadrons of tour buses and phalanxes of tents.

It is uniquely the Cuyahoga Valley, designed primarily as a passive day experience—an oasis of history and woods and water—in the vast metropolis of Northeast Ohio.

All things considered, it has been planned and organized well so far by the National Park Service.

There has been some controversy, to be sure, but remarkably little when one considers the size of this federal project. A new highway of this magnitude might well cause more dislocation and unrest.

Some residents did resent being bought out and moved; others accepted Park Service offers for their property without grudging. The Park Service's initial land agent, the Army Corps of Engineers, probably was too heavy-handed with some. However, a leader of Park Service opponents wound up getting more than \$600,000 for his property.

Whatever one's view in the park's first 10 years, the few land controversies that arose now appear as old history. The park is a fact of life today, there are few disputes, and under the able leadership of Lewis Albert, the Cuyahoga Valley superintendent, the Park Service looks ahead to gradual development and improvements that will make the valley an even finer experience for all who live in Northeast Ohio.

There are few cities in the United States, and virtually none in the older industrial states east of the Mississippi, blessed with such vast and treasured protected breathing space just outside their boundaries.

An increasing number of activities and programs are offered in the park, all designed to give those who take part an appreciation of the majesty of nature and of the rich history of this unusual part of America.

But one need not take part in any organized program to enjoy the valley. It is there for a Sunday drive, for a twilight walk along a ridge, for a fishing trip with eager-eyed children, or just for a rest in the sunshine in a meadow. And it acts as green space—a buffer and a protector—between two metropolitan areas, Akron and Cleveland.

Many people deserve credit for the foresight that not only created the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area but nurtured it along the way.

Of all those involved, however, two in my judgment stand out especially. They are congressmen John Seiberling, the Akron Democrat, and Ralph Regula, the Stark County Republican. Without them, the park would likely not exist today.

Someday, in some reasonable way, their contributions ought to be permanently memorialized in the valley by the naming of separate special features or projects there that acknowledge their efforts on behalf of all the people of Northeast Ohio.

In 2075, as the Cuyahoga Valley park is nearing its 100th birthday, its creation will be thought of universally as one of the wisest and most enduring decisions made by this region.

In the meantime, it is a place of beauty to visit often, a place in which to refresh the body and the soul and to enjoy the body



and the soul and to enjoy the richness of the land.

Just a short walk through the woods in the Cuyahoga Valley on a gorgeous day can provide both exercise and enchantment.●

SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1985

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator from North Carolina, the Honorable Sam J. Ervin, Jr.

As we all know, Senator Ervin, who liked to describe himself simply as an "ole country lawyer," was thrust into the national spotlight a decade ago during the Watergate crisis. He, of course, was selected as chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate Campaign Practices, whose job it was to investigate and find out the truth behind Watergate.

Long before Watergate, however, "Senator Sam" had earned the respect of his colleagues in that hallowed body. His quick wit, his ability to cite Bible verses, and to quote Shakespeare, made him one of the Senate's greatest orators of all time. He relished in telling a story or tale to make his point. As he once said, "I have always found if you got a good story that sort of fits things, a good story is worth an hour of argument."

Born on September 27, 1896, in Morganton, NC, Senator Ervin graduated from the University of North Carolina, then served 1½ years in France during World War I. He was wounded twice in battle and was cited twice for gallantry, including the Distinguished Service Cross and the Silver Star.

After the war, he returned home, earned a degree from Harvard Law School and, shortly thereafter, married his hometown sweetheart, Margaret Bruce Bell.

In 1925, he served in the North Carolina General Assembly, later became a county court and superior court judge, and served in this Chamber in 1946 and 1947. The following year, he was named to the North Carolina Supreme Court and, in 1954, was selected to serve in the Senate. He held this position until he voluntarily retired from public service in 1974. Although many urged him to serve another 6-year term in the Senate, which, I'm sure, he could have easily won, he followed the advice of his wife who said, "The time to quit is when people want you to stay."

Mr. Speaker, Senator Sam Ervin was a great scholar whose integrity and personal charm made him a favorite of all those who had the pleasure of working with him. Although I didn't agree with the Senator on every issue,

I always walked away knowing that he had put much thought behind a decision without any preconceived bias.

My wife, Lee, joins me in saluting Senator Sam Ervin for many years of dedicated public service. We offer our sincerest condolences to his wife, Margaret, their two daughters, Leslie and Laura, and son, Sam III.●

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, the expanding frontier of 19th century American presented opportunities to people who were willing to sacrifice comfort for the risk of independence and those who couldn't resist the lure of discovery. But it also presented formidable difficulties. One was the lack of a developed educational system. Thus, the land-grant college system was established by Congress and President Lincoln to fill that need for institutions of higher education in the isolated areas of the American frontier. To the credit of these 19th-century pioneers, who struggled to bring industry, culture, and educational excellence west of the Mississippi River, institutions like the University of Arizona now pay tribute to these ideals.

Arizona Territory's 13 legislature established Arizona's first 4-year university at Tucson in 1885. This year, the University of Arizona celebrates its centennial anniversary.

The early accomplishments of the University of Arizona in mining and agriculture led the way to early development of the Arizona Territory. From the early days of the Phelps-Dodge mining operation in Bisbee, AZ, became the leading producer of domestic copper. The University of Arizona Agriculture Department, long noted for its achievements in agricultural research, shares the responsibility for Arizona's position as this country's third largest cotton producer and as the leading exporter of Pima cotton, a high-quality variety developed at the University of Arizona.

Today, at its centennial celebration, the University of Arizona stands as one of the major academic and research universities in the world. Of the many fields of study prominent at the university, native American studies, engineering, optical sciences, arid land studies, astronomy and archeology are among the most noted. The University of Arizona Health Sciences Center is one of the medical schools pioneering artificial organ transplants and nuclear medicine. The new cancer research center will be second to none in the Nation.

As a contributor to America's national security, the University of Arizona has played a major role in the development of laser technology and in the space program.

The vitality of the university's academic community has provided continuity during the rapid growth of southern Arizona. As political activists, artists, writers, civil leaders, and community volunteers the university faculty, staff and students have made important contributions to the intellectual life of Tucson and communities throughout Arizona.

In one hand, the University of Arizona holds our past—the Indian tribes who irrigated the desert and the Spaniards who brought with them their knowledge of trade and commerce. In the other is our link to the future—the minds of our young people. Much like a parent, the University of Arizona is responsible for guiding each new generation to maturity. This great responsibility is shared by all who are concerned that education is more than a 12-year accumulation of data. It encompasses the ability to make decisions, to respect our peers, to care for and improve our institutions, and to add reason to problem-solving.

I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me today in expressing thanks and best wishes to the University of Arizona, founded in 1885, in its celebration of the beginning of its second 100 years of service to Arizona and to the Nation.●

AMERICAN BUSINESS ACTIVITY IN NICARAGUA

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Reagan administration's imposition of a trade embargo on Nicaragua, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article, "American Business Interests in Nicaragua," by Jason Adkins, a research associate with the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, which appears in the April 1985 issue of the monthly *Multinational Monitor*.

AMERICAN BUSINESS INTERESTS IN NICARAGUA  
(By Jason Adkins)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA.—Most American tourists here would have difficulty concluding that the United States and Nicaragua are at odds with one another. On one corner rests a Sandy's hamburger franchise and near-by, a branch of the Bank of America and an Avis Rent-A-Car outlet do business. Indeed while the Reagan administration may have lost patience with the Sandinistas, many U.S.-based corporate interests have not.

Though their numbers have declined by 25 percent since the Somoza regime col-

lapsed in 1979, many American multinationals are still operating in Nicaragua, Canada Dry and Mennen Company have gone home but United Fruit, Monsanto and over 30 other U.S. businesses either still base themselves here or do business with the Nicaraguans from neighboring Central American nations (see adjacent list).

U.S. companies also hold major interests in a dozen or more Nicaraguan firms; 50 percent interest in the Gemina flour mill, 75 percent interest in B.C.I. Chemicals and a 30-percent interest in the Polycasa plastics company.

In a random survey of American companies operating here, few U.S. business representatives advocated the overthrow of the Sandinista regime. To the contrary, a majority, though not all, offered a favorable opinion of their business relationship with the Sandinistas.

Monsanto, for example, has been operating a herbicide formulation plant here since 1967, developing chemical sprays that are used to protect cotton crops against pests and disease.

"The Sandinistas have been very friendly to us," said Richard Vance, director of the Latin American division of Monsanto. "Essentially the government is our only major purchaser, Vance said in a telephone interview from St. Louis, Mo. "We couldn't have it any easier."

Representatives of IBM and Nabisco expressed similar sentiments. IBM has had a plant in Managua since 1953. Its operation consists of three facilities: a branch office, a data center and an educational center. From these facilities, the company's 50 employees sell processing systems and typewriters. According to a company spokesperson, the government and other multinational businesses are IBM's chief customers.

"We have no complaints about doing business in Nicaragua," added the spokesperson, who requested anonymity. "Unlike many companies operating in Nicaragua, we are permitted to repatriate a small percentage of our profits to the United States in order to purchase 'critical parts' for our machines."

Similarly Nabisco, which has operated a plant in Managua since 1965, has had favorable relations with the Sandinistas. The company employs more than 250 people to produce cookies and crackers. While Nabisco would like to take more of its earnings out of the country, it believes it will have that opportunity when the economy improves. After all, a shortage of foreign exchange is common in many developing nations.

Other U.S. concerns describe their relations with the Sandinistas as being "purely professional." Exxon, which has been operating a large refinery in Nicaragua since the 1930's, is the largest corporation here. It employs 200 workers and distributes all of the refined oil in the country. While Shell, Texaco and Chevron together operate some 100 service stations here, Exxon manages 60 of its own. Jeff Higgins, Exxon's Latin America chief in Coral Gables, Florida, doesn't foresee his company leaving Nicaragua.

"We're permitted to repatriate profits when there are dollars available in the national treasury," he said. "As you know, the Nicaraguan government is our principle customer."

Ironically, Exxon's most recent setback in Nicaragua, was not at the hands of the Sandinistas, but at the hands of the U.S. backed Contras. Eighteen months ago, the Contras

set an Exxon storage tank at the Port of Corinto on fire, forcing the evacuation of 20,000 citizens.

Though several U.S. companies have left Nicaragua, many still do business here by operating from neighboring Guatemala or Costa Rica. Stanley Works, for example, has salespeople who travel throughout Central America selling tools. Likewise, Union Carbide sends its salespeople into Nicaragua to corner the battery market through local retailers. Manhattan Industries is another company that produces its dress and sports shirts in Costa Rica, and then distributes them in Nicaragua. According to Ed Herman, Director of Licensing for Manhattan Industries in New York, "business is more or less the same now in Nicaragua as it was for us in the 1970's. The volume is as good as it has always been. There are dollars available."

Naturally, not all U.S. concerns are pleased with events in Nicaragua. A sluggish economy has forced Evans Products of Portland, Oregon to close its hardwood mill in Matagalpa. Similarly, Standard Fruit and Steam Shipping Company of San Francisco no longer market Nicaragua's bananas. And the Bank of America has recently asked the Sandinistas to deactivate their business license so they can close the branch office that they have operated here since 1964.

The director of one of the largest multinational subsidiaries here agreed to be interviewed on the condition that neither he nor his company be identified. The Nicaraguan operation has gross annual revenues of \$85 million, including duties and taxes.

The only solution to the economic crises, the official insisted, was a change of government, but even if that doesn't happen, he said his company has no intention of leaving. "We are making money now," he said. And even though it's in cordobas, it's still a 15 percent profit, he said.

Since the company is financially self-sufficient, the parent company in the U.S. is determined it is in their best interests to keep the operation here. Their hope is that sooner, not later, the company will be able to repatriate profits without limitations. But, he concluded, "We're doing alright in the mean time."

The United States remains Nicaragua's largest trading partner, purchasing 18 percent of the country's exports. Last year the U.S. consumed dozens of different Nicaraguan products: bananas, meat, shrimp, coffee, tobacco, garments, sugar and furniture. And Nicaragua imports insecticides, paper goods, animal oils, fertilizer, and agricultural machinery here.

Ironically, some of Nicaragua's best U.S. trading partners have included some unlikely candidates. Take the case of Pandol Brothers, Inc., a large agricultural conglomerate based in California's San Joaquin Valley. Sons of Yugoslavian immigrants, the Pandol's total corporate sales in 1983 exceeded \$200 million. Jack Pandol, 61, a former member of the California Board of Food and Agriculture (appointed by then Governor Ronald Reagan), and his brother, Matt, 47, distribute all of Nicaragua's bananas in the United States.

Since December of 1982, a freighter from San Francisco has been picking up 2,000 tons of bananas from the Port of Corinto weekly and shipping them to Port Huene-me, California. There the Pandols distribute the produce to grocery stores in California, Oregon, Washington and Western Canada.

"We make about \$10 million a year off Nicaragua's bananas," explained a Pandol

Brothers spokesperson, who asked not to be identified. "The Nicaraguans come out of this deal with less than \$5 million," he added, "But they're still ahead."

Indeed, the Nicaraguans speak fondly of this fruitful if not unusual partnership (the Pandol's ranch was the first to be struck by Cesar Chavez of the United Farm Workers in 1965 because of their notorious labor practices). The Pandols, who have assisted the Sandinistas in acquiring badly needed farm equipment, agricultural chemicals and other supplies, received token assistance from the Reagan administration. Bill Deaver, administrative assistant to Rep. Charles (Chip) Pashayan Jr. (R-Cal.) and younger brother of White House aide Michael Deaver, set up a national security council briefing for Jack Pandol on Nicaragua.

In spite of occasional assistance for a few American friends and the private sector in Nicaragua (a Reagan-inspired organization, the National Endowment for Democracy, contributed \$150,000 to COSEP, an opposition private sector organization and \$100,000 to La Prensa, Nicaragua's privately held opposition newspaper, among other groups), the Reagan administration prefers a policy of economic disengagement from Nicaragua. For example, in 1983, the U.S. reduced Nicaragua's sugar quota by 90 percent, forcing it to sell the bulk of its product at the lower world market price.

U.S. officials here contend there won't be an upsurge in American trade until greater confidence is felt from the private sector. This is despite the fact that only two major U.S. companies have been expropriated since the Nicaraguan revolution, according to Paul Reichler, a Washington lawyer who represents Nicaragua. The Neptune Mining Corporation and Rosario Mining Company were nationalized in 1980 as part of the government's efforts to control "critical" natural resources. The Nicaraguans are currently paying a settlement fee of \$15.5 million to these mining companies. No other pending litigation or outstanding judgements exist between U.S. companies and the Sandinistas.

As former President Jimmy Carter pointed out in a recent interview, a greater percentage of industry is in private hands in Nicaragua than in Britain. Indeed, Nicaragua has a greater percentage of industry in private hands than either France or the Scandinavian countries.

Ever mindful that it must increase its trading base with the United States, the Nicaraguans are preparing to unveil a new foreign investment law that has been three years in the making. Its purpose is to attract U.S. and foreign trade. This new law, which was written in part by a group of New York lawyers, may bolster the financially pressed Nicaraguan economy. ●

#### KILDEE PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, a new and exciting trend within the private foundation community is the formation and growth of community founda-



tions. These community foundations can be effective in addressing a broad range of charitable concerns and unmet needs in the home area.

The momentum for this trend was sparked by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, MI. Mott initiated a nationwide program to encourage the formation and growth of community foundations in 1979. By 1981, it had committed \$750,000 to community endowments to six areas, from the District of Columbia to North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, the Mott Foundation has long been recognized in Flint, in Michigan, and indeed, around the world as a philanthropic organization with strong qualities of leadership and foresight. Under the capable leadership of President William S. White, the Mott Foundation, has blazed an impressive course of charitable generosity which has made the decisive difference in literally countless worthwhile projects.

I want to take this opportunity to bring to Members' attention an article which recently appeared in *Foundation News*. Entitled "Seed Planting, Community Foundation Style," the story highlights this new trend within the private foundation community.

[From the *Foundation News*, January-February 1985]

#### SEED PLANTING, COMMUNITY FOUNDATION STYLE

At first glance there is nothing special about this front page headline from the *Evening Telegram* of Superior, Wisconsin. It reports a 1983 grant by The Bush Foundation of St. Paul, to the Duluth-Superior Area Community Foundation formed earlier that year.

But in fact, that event is something special. For the Bush grant reflects a trend in which a growing number of private foundations are helping to start community foundations.

Last July, indeed, The Kresge Foundation announced a grant of \$5 million to the recently formed Community Foundation of Southeastern Michigan. That was the largest grant ever by a private foundation to start a community foundation.

The Kresge Foundation and The Bush Foundation have assets of \$792 million and \$265 million, respectively. Why should they want to start community foundations in their states?

One answer comes from Kresge Chairman William H. Baldwin. Noting that Detroit is one of the last major metropolitan areas without a large community foundation, Baldwin says that having a strong United Way, and having "strong educational, health and cultural institutions, which we do, is not enough. There remain unmet needs which the community foundation can help to meet."

As a foundation with a national program that directs most of its grants to construction and renovation projects outside of its home area, The Kresge Foundation will, with this single grant, reach a broad range of charitable concerns in Detroit.

As for The Bush Foundation, its grant provides a way to address the needs of a greatly depressed area while relying on the board and staff of the Duluth-Superior

Community Foundation, who know their territory.

Duluth-Superior's application to The Bush Foundation described the new community foundation as a way to respond to changing needs of the Mesabi Iron Range communities whose economics have been in decline, to break down long-standing rivalries between Duluth and Superior, to introduce a broadened sense of community, to bridge the gap between the public and the private sector, and to offer a neutral forum in which to respond to area-wide issues and attract outside dollars into a poor region.

Some 2,000 miles to the west, Hugh Burroughs, program officer for The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation of Menlo Park, California, explains Hewlett's grants of \$500,000 to each of four community foundations in the San Francisco Bay and Monterey Peninsula areas in this way:

"We are interested in increasing private philanthropy and in having a body to deal with community problems in ways that we, as a private foundation, are not staffed to do."

#### TREND BEGAN WITH MOTT

The momentum for these important new community assets was sparked by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan. Mott initiated a nationwide program to encourage the formation and growth of community foundations in 1979. By 1981, it had committed \$750,000 to community endowments in six areas, from the District of Columbia to North Dakota.

But the program really reached high gear when Mott budgeted another \$1,400,000 to enable the Council on Foundations to start a five-year program of extensive technical assistance to developing community foundations. By far the largest portion is reserved for monetary grants to challenge the growth of some 16 to 20 community foundations, each of whom will receive extended technical assistance.

Since most locations now receiving Mott-sponsored assistance from the Council are themselves foundation-poor, they genuinely need both the flexible endowment and the philanthropic leadership that a community foundation provides.

#### CORPORATE PARTICIPATION GROWING

Corporate contributors are becoming increasingly involved as well. Over the past five years, the Levi Strauss Foundation and the Aetna Life and Casualty Foundation have instituted grant programs to start and revitalize community foundations in areas where their related business corporations have facilities and interests.

Another major catalyst from the private foundation sector is the Gannett Foundation. From early 1983 through September, 1984 Gannett made \$422,000 worth of start-up or revitalization grants to 12 community foundations. Amounts ranged from \$8,200 in Fremont, Nebraska to \$58,000 in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

"Our purpose," says Gannett President Eugene C. Dorsey, "is to ease the administrative and publications cost burdens of these fledgling foundations so that they can concentrate on obtaining the endowment and other gifts necessary to project new philanthropic resources into their communities." Gannett committed another \$300,000 in 1984, which it has repeated this year.

As early grantees in the program are phased out, Gannett will fund start-ups in other of the 170 locations served by subsidiaries of the Gannett Co., Inc., the nationwide communications firm. And as its start-

up mission is accomplished, Gannett may shift focus to established community foundations.

#### MOTT PLUS GANNETT EQUAL MOMENTUM

The incentive to local residents to build community endowments is increased where Gannett Foundation and Mott Foundation interests coincide, as they do in Tucson, Phoenix and the state of Delaware.

The community foundations in such places can hope for up to \$100,000 worth of help from these two exterior foundations to defray initial costs of operation—and even more when other corporations or foundations, such as Levi Strauss or the Aetna Life and Casualty Foundation, also take interest. The happy byproduct is more incentive for local action.

Using its Mott grant, the Council on Foundations is able to send into these communities board and staff members from successful community foundations and a technical assistance consultant. Knowing they can call upon outside expertise without cost, local leaders more readily take part in the development of community foundations for their areas.

#### PRIVATE-COMMUNITY CHALLENGES

Foundations with national and regional programs directed to educational or other specific concerns increasingly are giving support for establishing or revitalizing community foundations in their headquarters areas.

Within the past five years, the Bremer Foundation, Northwest Area Foundation and The Bush Foundation in the Twin Cities, Minnesota, challenged North Dakotans to initiate the community foundation that now serves that state; the Boston-based Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust has given the new Hampshire Charitable Fund a \$200,000 grant to energize community foundations for Maine and Vermont, and a \$400,000 grant to stimulate a \$1 million fund for depressed counties in Northern New Hampshire; and the Irvine Foundation added \$100,000 to a \$50,000 gift of the Sacramento Junior League to start a community foundation for California's capitol area.

Challenge grants from private foundations and corporations provide a classic illustration of leveraging at its strongest. The new Albuquerque Community Foundation has agreed to raise \$230,000 to qualify for \$45,000 from the Mott Foundation.

The seven-county Coastal Bend Community Foundation of Corpus Christi, started by the Paul and Mary Hass Foundation, asked for and received from the Mott Foundation a nine for one match. It is raising \$300,000 to qualify for \$27,000 from Mott.

Such challenge grants by foundations and corporations outside a community exert a powerful incentive within it. Once extended, local pride and the desire to draw funds into the community take hold.

Within 12 months of receiving its \$750,000 challenge from The Bush Foundation, for example, the Duluth-Superior Community Foundation had in hand gifts and firm pledges of \$500,000 to meet the dollar for dollar challenge to build \$500,000 in unrestricted endowment. In addition it had \$100,000 in donor-advised funds.

Duluth-Superior will receive the remaining \$250,000 from The Bush Foundation if it succeeds in raising an additional \$1.75 million in gifts.

Even the Kresge grant to Detroit, looming large at \$5 million, has an arduous challenge mixed in with so obvious an endorsement. The first \$3 million is an outright

gift, but Detroit must raise \$4 million to claim the remaining \$2 million from Kresge.

#### INCENTIVE IS ONLY FIRST STEP

Incentive grants to spur a community to create a start-up endowment can yield a rich reward, but they do not by any means guarantee automatic success. The key—as in most of life's undertakings—is still plenty of plain, hard work. No group knows this better than the Greater Tacoma Community Foundation, which was formed in 1981.

**The Incentives.**—Technical assistance and the carrot of a possible \$45,000 toward operating costs extended by the Mott Foundation drew a challenge grant of \$270,000 in late 1983 from an anonymous Tacoma foundation.

To meet the local foundation's matching requirements, the board of the Greater Tacoma Community Foundation, within four weeks of the challenge, pledged \$330,000 to create an operating endowment that would total \$600,000 if a second condition could be met by year-end 1984.

The second condition was that the \$270,000 challenge be double matched to establish also a permanent endowment for unrestricted grants.

**The Rewards.**—If it could meet those challenges, the Greater Tacoma Foundation would add \$1,140,000 to its endowment in only 15 months.

Adding to the excitement, a local bank with fiduciary responsibilities expressed its intention to convert \$2.3 million of the charitable trusts it administers into component funds of the Tacoma foundation early in 1985—if the challenges were met.

In sum, if all the pieces fell (or could be pushed) into place, the Greater Tacoma Community Foundation would hold assets of nearly \$4 million within less than five years of its incorporation—virtual insurance of long term success.

**The Risk.**—There was, of course, a very real risk that Tacoma would not meet the challenge. Indeed, by last November just two months from the 1984 year-end deadline for raising the \$870,000 required to qualify for \$270,000 more only \$510,000 had been raised.

More than \$300,000 still had to be raised within those final 60 days. Board, staff and volunteers scrambled to close pledges already solicited and to reach new prospects.

**The Result.**—This story has a happy ending. Just before Christmas, Tacoma Executive Director Paul Bender reported that \$887,000 had been raised, putting the foundation \$17,000 beyond its goal and qualifying it for the \$270,000.

Perhaps the most heartwarming moment in that hectic stretch drive came in the form of a \$25,000 gift from Tacoma's nearby sister, the Seattle Community Foundation.

**The Lessons.**—Tacoma's strong closing demonstrate that great value of a challenge grant as a spur to productive action. It also demonstrated that a challenge is indeed hard work, requiring pursuit of immediate pledges from living donors, businesses and private foundations.

The appeal must be to the prospect's vision of the community foundation's potential for service. It requires that the board, staff and volunteers have sufficient commitment, tenacity and clout to convince community leaders that pledging one-time, lifetime gifts to build the foundation's endowment to its take-off point is "the thing to do."

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL THRESHOLD

Tacoma's story also illustrates the Catch-22 difficulty of all such community endow-

ments. Before they have \$1 million in assets, they lack local credibility. Residents hesitate to make wills in favor of an agency whose permanence, stability, grant and investment capacities may not be assured.

But experience shows that the more the assets of a newly formed or revitalizing community foundation rise above \$1 million, the more credibility it has as an enduring organization.

This in turn illustrates the great value of seed grants as well as challenges. "In one year," says Greater Tucson Foundation executive director Donna Grant, "we raised over \$1 million when it usually takes five, and now we're close to our second million. It was Mott's investment that gave us credibility for our fundraising in the community."

The seed money from Mott was also important, adds Grant, because Arizona is "foundation poor," making credibility all the harder to establish.

#### NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION

Recognizing the need to reach the "credibility level" as soon as possible, corporations and private foundations that are funding start-up or revitalization of community foundations are requiring that they plan immediate fund-development campaigns and engage staff to implement them.

To meet the matching requirements that qualified it for the \$270,000 challenge grant, leaders of the Greater Tacoma Community Foundation conducted a select-prospect, pyramidal campaign.

"Select prospect" means that only about 100 financially capable donors are asked to contribute. "Pyramidal" means that a few donors at the apex are asked to give in six figures, while at the very base of the pyramid some 40 donors are asked to give in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 range.

#### ACCEPTANCE BY LOCAL CHARITIES

Spurred by start-up challenge grants and technical assistance from private foundations, a number of recently formed community foundations have hit the ground running.

This contrasts with the style of earlier decades in which community foundations formed and then patiently waited for benefactors to die. In the process, many of the foundations died before any benefactors were persuaded to bequeath their estates.

Another reason for the faster growth of new community foundations is the demise of the notion that community foundations should not compete with the charitable agencies they are formed to help.

Most agencies now recognize that until a community foundation raises endowment, it cannot help at all.

A good example of this new community understanding is the story of The Heritage Fund of Bartholomew County, Indiana. Several years after its formation in 1977, Heritage began a select prospect, pyramidal campaign to bring its permanent, unrestricted endowment to \$3 million.

Within 24 months it had exceeded its goal in pledges from some 85 donors of named funds, payable within three to five years—this in a community with only 65,000 residents! With community leadership clearly favorable to the new enterprise, no opposition developed from other charitable institutions.

Since three Fortune 500 companies are headquartered in Bartholomew County, it is of course not typical of areas of comparable population. As a general rule, the further an area's population is below 250,000, the greater the difficulty a community founda-

tion is likely to have in building an endowment.

Less populous communities do better by attaching themselves as local funds of larger community foundations.

#### GROWTH NEED NOT WAIT

The traditional assumption that a community foundation must wait patiently for decades to reach an effective size is now being rejected by many, among them the 12-year-old Community Foundation of the Greater Baltimore Area.

Baltimore had accumulated only \$3 million by 1983, and less than 2 percent of that was unrestricted. With Mott Foundation administrative support, Baltimore began a select prospect, pyramidal campaign to bring endowment to \$10 million within five years. At least half of that was to be subject neither to donor designation nor advice.

The goal of \$10 million was selected because the history of nearly all community foundations shows that once they reach that figure, their growth takes off markedly.

With the moral support of local charities and the financial support of businesses—some of whom have contributed unrestricted capital of \$200,000 each—Baltimore's community foundation had already attracted 42 named funds totaling over \$4 million by early 1985.

Better still, \$3 million of this endowment is either unrestricted or committed to broad fields such as the aged or mental health.

Besides Baltimore's strong business support, six private foundations are providing three-year operating support, while another 14 have added more than \$1.5 million to the endowment.

#### EXCEPTIONS

Once of the latter, the Morris Goldseker Foundation, always targets its grants to specific program areas, yet contributed \$150,000 in unrestricted funds to the community foundation.

The exception, says Goldseker Director Timothy Ambruster, was made in light of the value of having a public foundation "to respond to needs from all segments of the community in ways which private foundations like ours typically cannot."

Other impressive evidence that a community foundation need not be dependent on the slow growth of maturing wills is provided by the Oregon Community Foundation. Formed in 1973, The Oregon Community Foundation has obtained \$28 million from multiple sources in only 11 years—irrefutable evidence that the \$10 million "take-off" point can be reached, and passed, in a relatively few years.

Nor is the degree of unrestricted endowment in Baltimore, including that contributed by corporations, necessary unique.

The Cummins Engine Company of Columbus, Indiana and the Mott Foundation also have made significant contributions in this category, as has the Minnesota Power Company, which donated \$75,000 of unrestricted funds to the newly formed Duluth-Superior Foundation.

#### OTHER KEYS TO SUCCESS

In Duluth-Superior, Baltimore and other areas where community foundations are actively campaigning to reach their take-off point for growth, a select prospect, pyramidal campaign is not the exclusive funding method. It is only a means to more rapid start-up growth, or growth to the take-off point.



The community foundations in such places are also seeking bequests and deferred gifts, managing agency endowments and pursuing other traditional ways of building endowments over the long term.

Fulltime staffing by community foundations from their outset, immediate campaigns to bring capital to seven and eight figures, start-up gifts to \$5 million by national foundations, unrestricted six-figure grants by locally headquartered businesses, active encouragement by local United Ways and other charitable institutions, purposeful capital campaigning by both new and older community foundations to reach the "take-off" point for growth and service—these are trends that are propelling the growth of the community foundation field in the 1980s.

#### NOT FOR CITIES ONLY

Such trends promise over the next decade to extend community foundations into most areas with populations over 250,000, including areas that are foundation-poor and hard to reach such as Northern New England, Montana, Mississippi, New Mexico, South Dakota, the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and a host of other places.

Private foundations and corporations are to be commended for enabling these bypassed areas to accumulate and attract charitable capital.

By conditioning their support on the inclusion of less served communities that surround the richer core of a city, Mott and other funders also encourage new community foundations to provide for less wealthy satellite areas.

Aided by the Mott Foundation and joined in community foundation extension by a growing number of its members, the Council on Foundations is pushing to entrench this form of philanthropy in all regions of the United States.

From Tacoma to San Diego on our West Coast and Maine to Palm Beach County on our East Coast, the Council is currently offering start-up help to community foundations and to citizen groups working in Billings, Wilmington, Peoria, and many other areas not currently served.

To minimize false starts and risks of failure, Mott has set the pace among funders that now are requiring local matching funds, and are reserving their help for communities that can demonstrate the resolve, the leadership, the staying power, the resources and the larger population bases needed for successful development.

#### FOUR GOALS

These are the directions in which the community foundation field is headed: a community foundation to be put in place in every significant population center, revitalization of community foundations whose growth has slowed, purposefully accelerated growth to its take-off point for every community foundation with assets under \$10 million, and an increase in permanent unrestricted endowment to give each community foundation a greater capacity to respond to changing needs in its area.

These are objectives of the community foundation field and of the growing number of private foundations and corporations that see community foundations as the prime device for the formation of flexible, private, charitable capital for our nation's communities.

Their ultimate goal is the long-term strengthening of each community's capacity to respond to its own need with private resources raised from local donors.●

## MARIANNE MELE HALL RESIGNS

### HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, Marianne Mele Hall resigned from the Copyright Royalty Tribunal yesterday after a weeklong public outcry over her role in editing a book that was insulting to blacks—and offensive to all Americans.

Ms. Hall is to be commended for her decision to step down, but in the aftermath of this sad episode, there is a larger and far more important question that needs to be asked.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the process by which administration personnel are selected for office?

This latest episode involving Ms. Hall is far from an isolated incident. Over the course of the last 5 years, the list of individuals appointed to positions of influence and responsibility—only later to be found unfit to serve—has grown exponentially.

It all began in the first months of President Reagan's administration when his National Security Adviser, Richard Allen, was forced to resign under a cloud of scandal and controversy. And since that time, the parade of disappointment and disillusionment has continued—seemingly without end. One official after another has been discovered to be unfit or unable to serve.

EPA Administrator Anne Burford. Deputy Secretary of Commerce Guy Fiske. Acting EPA Administrator John Hernandez. Superfund Chief Rita Lavelle. CIA Deputy Director Max Hugel. Veterans Administrator Robert Nimmo. A slew of directors at the Synthetic Fuels Corp. Secretary of the Interior James Watt. Education Department officials Eileen Gardner and Lawrence Uzzell. And now Marianne Hall.

All of these people were put in place through political appointment procedures. And all of these people were later forced to resign under public charges of malfeasance, or incompetence, or gross insensitivity.

Mr. Speaker, something is wrong. Over the course of the next several months, we are all going to have to take a long, hard, sobering look at the procedures by which top administration officials are selected.

When the White House appoints individuals it has selected to "get the job done," we must be assured that those people know what "getting the job done" entails. Senate confirmation hearings must become more than perfunctory exercises, and our own responsibility for congressional oversight cannot be overlooked.●

## BITBURG VISIT CAUSES GREAT SADNESS

### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's visit to the Bitburg Cemetery last Sunday has caused great sadness throughout our Nation. Citizens of Ohio's Ninth Congressional District—which I represent—from all walks of life and all religious and ethnic backgrounds have come to me to express their profound disapproval of our President's visit to the grave site of SS troopers.

In a letter to President Reagan, Rev. George M. Rinkowski, president of the Toledo Chapter of the Polish American Congress and a former military chaplain, articulates some of the reasons many Americans were viscerally opposed to the Bitburg visit. I commend Reverend Rinkowski's letter to my colleagues:

TOLEDO, OH.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please avoid paying homage or giving honor to the members of the German Armed Forces who were rational instruments of an aggression to destroy freedom all over the world. We fought a just war, a Crusade for Freedom, against a ruthless enemy who intended to impose his will over his opponent. Karl Von Clausewitz proclaimed that "Warfare therefore is an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfill our will". The intention is survival of the fittest with no consideration given to the value of human life. In the theory of Clausewitz, the success in war is measured by the amount of materiel captured and the number of prisoners taken. The practice of enslaving prisoners by the World War II Germans is proven in history.

Our principle in war is one of the reasons for our existence as a nation, under God: namely, to provide for the common defense. This is the principle that guarantees that the war is a just war. In warfare it is possible for both sides to be wrong. That would be an unjust war. World judgment condemns Germany as aggressor, and acclaims the Crusade for Freedom as a just war fought by the allies.

The amnesty granted to prisoners and members of the German armed forces was an act of reconciliation which we would not have received from the aggressors. This amnesty was not given to those leaders who were judged as criminals, condemned and executed or imprisoned, some to this very day. They were condemned because they committed crimes against humanity. One of every five, over twenty percent of Polish Citizens were killed by the aggression. Half of that number in concentration camps.

War is not a game in which opponents are striving for a legitimate prize. A nation is not allowed to expose itself to annihilation. It must fight for its existence. We justly fought for our own continued existence and that of many other nations and secured that existence.

To give honor to the aggressor soldiers would validate the aggression in which they were human instruments making it possible for the inhumanities in the war and in the concentration camps to happen. We destroyed the material instruments of war. We granted amnesty to the human instruments. If we honor the aggressor warrior in the acts of aggression, we equate those acts with the heroism of those who won the crusade for freedom.

Mr. President, please do not validate the aggression of forty years' ago by exonerating them from the stigma of an unjust war and honoring them for aiding and abetting the terrible inhumanities whose evil effects will not be erased in the foreseeable future.

The wounds of wars suffered by 28.5 million veterans in our land would be opened again. Their acts of heroism would be rated as equal to acts of aggression perpetrated by war criminals. It seems that the correct evaluation of the request by Mr. Kohl might be a politically calculated act to validate a former aggression and exonerate their actions. The presence of SS troops makes any consideration of giving honor far worse. It seems that the only reason for the existence of the SS troops was to perform acts of atrocity against human beings.

You are Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and chief of all the veterans. Consider what effect an act honoring the former aggressors would have on these men and women who now serve and those who formerly served to guarantee freedom in our world.

Sincerely and respectfully submitted,  
REV. GEORGE M. RINKOWSKI,  
Former Chaplain in the Army and  
Air Force of the United States of America.●

#### PAULETTE PIDCOCK HONORED

##### HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call attention to an outstanding woman in government relations, Paulette Carnicelli Pidcock, who justifiably won recognition from the Women in Government Relations, a national organization, in the following article from its 1984 annual report. Ms. Pidcock is employed with the Baltimore Gas & Electric. Co.

1984 DISTINGUISHED MEMBER

Selection of WGR's Distinguished Member requires extensive research into the depth and diversity of the nominees' of service. Both quantitative and qualitative contributions are considered. Personal leadership, initiation of ideas and enhancement of WGR's visibility and reputation in the Washington community are all criteria toward the selection decision.

Paulette Pidcock has provided consistently outstanding service to Women in Government Relations since becoming a member in 1977. Her leadership and vision became obvious early on when, as chair of the fledgling Member Relations Committee, she recommended and produced the first member handbook, one of our most valuable tools to this day. As editor of the WGR Newsletter, Paulette professionalized its appearance, upgraded and enlarged its news content and set up a system to attract outside subscrib-

ers to promote the organization and generate new revenue.

Paulette was elected WGR Treasurer at a critical time in the organization's growth. Under her leadership, WGR's financial picture improved markedly, primarily because of her development of investment and budget planning. She instituted a Finance Committee, quarterly financial statements and committee review and audit procedures.

As chair of a specially-appointed Special Projects Committee, Paulette produced the first of several Public Policy Forums which provided visibility for the organization among colleagues, government officials and the media unparalleled in our history. Her service as an elected Board member and as member of numerous committees has been outstanding, innovative and constant.

As WGR's President in 1982-83, Paulette brought a fine sense of both organization and leadership to the group during a period of intense growth. She brought WGR to a new level of service to its members. Her dedication to detail, planning and administrative efficiency stand us in good stead today.

Paulette's service to profession and community go well outside the bounds of WGR. She is a recognized leader within her industry and at the forefront of women's activities in Washington's professional community. She is an example to all as she constantly seeks to learn new things, try new dedications and share her talents in so many areas.

Beyond her outstanding record in very visible service, Paulette has always offered those special qualities which distinguish her among her peers. Her gracious and calm manner—with a flash of Italian Pizzazz—along with her personal style of confidence, curiosity and originality have long made her a role model among us. She is always willing to share her advice and counsel with younger women looking for ways to advance. She is just as generous with her time among long-time friends and colleagues.

She has truly distinguished herself as leader, participant, student, teacher, counselor and friend. She is a very special woman.●

#### THE POTENTIAL HARM OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S TAX SIMPLIFICATION PROPOSAL

##### HON. MICKEY EDWARDS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan is scheduled soon to receive the Treasury Department's tax simplification proposal.

I have many reservations about the original draft of the Treasury plan because of its potential harm to the energy industry through the elimination of tax incentives for oil and gas producers.

Someone else who shares my concerns about the adverse effects of this proposal is Donald Lambro, a commentator for National Public Radio.

Because he and I are of like mind on this important issue, I am inserting in the RECORD a transcript of his com-

mentary which was broadcast on March 25, 1985.

Treasury Secretary James Baker is now in the midst of quiet negotiations to work out a compromise tax reform plan.

Every provision in the Treasury's tax simplification plan, Baker says, is negotiable. But he warns that every loophole that stays in the tax code adversely affects how far tax rates can be lowered.

He also warns that reducing tax rates and closing loopholes will mean higher taxes for businesses.

And that is exactly what's in store for many businesses if the Treasury's misguided plan is adopted.

One of the major reasons for tax reform is to improve incentives for work, savings, investment and economic growth.

But some of the administration's proposals to broaden the business tax base would in fact impede economic growth.

For example, if proposes eliminating the 10 percent investment tax credit which has allowed businesses to cut nearly \$30 billion a year in investment costs from their tax bills.

And it would replace the system of accelerated depreciation of plants and equipment with a much lower tax deduction schedule.

The effect of this says supply-side economist Paul Craig Roberts, "is to worsen [investment] incentives and to raise the cost of new capital."

True, the Treasury plan would reduce corporate tax rates by 28 percent. But that would be more than offset by a 170-percent increase in the business tax base for new investments.

This will hit America's aging industrial plants right in their smokestacks, robbing them of the new investment they must have to become competitive both here and abroad.

Eliminating current tax preferences for new investment will also hit small, unincorporated businesses.

What all of this means is that the income base on which businesses can be taxed will be raised at the expense of new capital investment. This will discourage investment and that in the long run will stunt economic growth.

Somewhere along the way to President Reagan's desk the Treasury's tax reform plan lost sight of one of its chief purposes: encouraging new investment and business expansion.

If the president's tax reform plan is to win public support, it must meet at least three tests.

It must retain and expand incentives for increased capital investment.

It must encourage new business formations and job creation.

And it must broaden incentives for savings.

Unfortunately, the administration's reform plan fails to pass these tests.

This is Donald Lambro . . . in Washington.●



ALFRED D'ALESSANDRO, MASSACHUSETTS SMALL BUSINESSPERSON OF THE YEAR

### HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge Mr. Alfred D'Alessandro of Gloucester, MA, who is in Washington this week being honored as the small businessperson of the year from Massachusetts.

Mr. D'Alessandro, owner and president of AID-PAC Corp., brings credit not only to our State and his profession, but also to all small business men and women in the United States.

Mr. D'Alessandro is a leader in the packaged liquids field. Using technology first developed overseas, his company has successfully marketed a process whereby raw plastic is blown into molded bottle shapes, is then filled with the liquid to be packaged, and is finally hermetically sealed, all in one continuous operation.

Most importantly, AID-PAC Corp. has developed a number of innovations such as the first plastic bottle approved by the FDA for packaging biological solutions used in reconstituting human blood.

When a large domestic food corporation refused to develop Mr. D'Alessandro's packaging techniques, he formed AID-PAC in 1971. Today, the company has grown to employ over 100 persons with projected sales of over \$5 million this year.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans can take pride in the accomplishments of Mr. Albert D'Alessandro and the other small businesspersons of the year who are being honored here this week. They are continuing the tradition of innovation which has served to place the small business sector in the forefront of the Nation's economic growth.●

### BONN DRUG TALKS

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I was pleased to read accounts in the press last weekend that the seven heads of government meeting at the Bonn economic summit held impromptu discussions on international drug trafficking.

These unscheduled talks apparently took place when President Reagan raised the issue as he and his summit partners were sitting down to a state dinner. Noting the First Lady's strong

interest in the problem of drug abuse, the President reportedly told the other world leaders that stopping "international drug trafficking requires international cooperation." What followed was a spontaneous, hour-long discussion during which, according to the Washington Post, "It was noted that harvests of opium and coca, as well as the seizure by police of their addictive derivatives heroin and cocaine, have reached record levels." British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, "echoed by other leaders," reportedly called for strengthening international cooperation against drug trafficking. Afterward, a happily surprised President Reagan was reported to have said that, "Never have I seen my summit partners so united and determined on a single subject."

Mr. Speaker, four reports issued earlier this year, by the U.N. International Narcotics Control Board, the State Department, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, all indicate that worldwide production of illicit narcotics crops is expanding. Our Select Committee on Narcotics estimates that in 1984, 85 tons of cocaine, 10 tons of heroin, 15,000 to 16,000 tons of marijuana, and 200 tons of hashish entered the United States. We are not the only victims of this trade, however. Heroin, and now ever increasing amounts of cocaine, are finding a ready market in Western Europe. Producing and transshipment countries around the world are discovering that they, too, are victims of the drug traffic as growing numbers of their citizens fall prey to drug abuse.

Clearly, nothing short of an all-out, concerted international assault on narcotics trafficking will succeed in stemming the worldwide drug trade and the misery of drug abuse it causes. I commend the President for raising this issue at the recent summit and elevating narcotics control to the top priority it requires if we are to make any progress against the scourge of drug abuse and drug trafficking. I hope the conference in Bonn was just a start. I hope the President, encouraged by the strong interest and concern of the other world leaders, will continue to use every international forum available to him and our country, including the United Nations, to press for strong international action against drug trafficking. I hope that, following the successful example of the First Lady's meetings in Washington to discuss drug abuse with the first ladies of 17 other nations, President Reagan will give serious consideration to convening a summit conference to devise effective international strategies for attacking the drug trade.

At this point, I insert in the Record for the information of my colleagues articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times describing the drug talks at Bonn summit.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1985]

### UNSCHEDULED TOPIC OF DRUG TRADE FINDS RARE UNITY AMONG LEADERS (By William Drozdiak)

BONN.—As the summit's seven heads of government sat down last night to a sumptuous dinner of salmon and veal in lavender honey sauce, they bewildered their aides by launching into a spirited discussion of international problems posed by the proliferation of drug trafficking.

In what White House spokesman Larry Speakes called an "unexpected twist" in their first group encounter, the seven leaders spoke for nearly an hour about the urgent need to tame the blight of drug addiction in all of their countries.

The catalyst happened to be Nancy Reagan's antidrug campaign, which she is pursuing in Rome while her husband participates in the seven-nation economic summit here. The first order of business among the industrialized world's leaders, even before soup was served, evolved out of Reagan's offhand comments about his wife's trip.

The first lady drew praise for her crusades, which has enlisted the help of numerous spouses of foreign leaders, including the wives of Prime Minister Brian Mulroney of Canada and Bettino Craxi of Italy. Mrs. Reagan's recent summit of first ladies in Washington publicized the common threat that industrialized as well as developing countries now face from widespread drug abuse.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, echoed by other leaders, said it was now all the more imperative to strengthen international cooperation in fighting the drug trade.

It was noted that harvests of opium and coca, as well as the seizure by police of their addictive derivatives heroin and cocaine, have reached record levels.

Reagan, happily surprised by the intense interest shown in the subject, remarked that "never have I seen all my summit partners so united and determined on a single subject."

Before tackling their normal agenda of trade and political issues, the seven leaders decided to instruct their foreign ministers to hold a special discussion today to find ways of enhancing cross-border cooperation among drug enforcement agencies.

"We have picked up another assignment, which was unexpected," Secretary of State George P. Shultz told reporters today. "It wasn't on our agenda, particularly. It emerged from the discussion by the heads of state on this subject, and it may very well be that one of the most important people to this meeting is not here—namely, Nancy Reagan."

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1985]

### PROBLEMS OF DRUGS IS RAISED IN BONN—U.S. AND BRITAIN LEAD SESSION ON STRONGER BATTLE AGAINST NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING (By John Tagliabue)

BONN.—Participants in the seven-nation economic conference here spent much of their time today discussing the worldwide battle against drug abuse.

A Reagan Administration official voiced doubts that "anything specific will come out of this meeting."

But he said the foreign ministers, attending the conference had already "made a good deal of progress in just raising the international consciousness on the subject."

West Germany's Foreign Minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, said experts from the seven nations would continue the discussions within the framework of international organizations, like the United Nations.

The White House spokesman, Larry Speakes, said drugs emerged as the major topic at a state dinner Thursday evening when President Reagan raised the issue, telling the world leaders that stamping out "international drug trafficking requires international cooperation."

#### TOPICS OF CONCERN TO MRS. REAGAN

The President was evidently following up on an issue that his wife, Nancy, has shown a major interest in as First Lady.

Last month, Mrs. Reagan was host to a White House meeting of 17 first ladies from around the world that she called to discuss ways of battling drug abuse. On Thursday, as part of the Reagans' official state visit to West Germany, the First Lady presented a check for \$5,000 from the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth to the Parents' Circle, which represents West German parent groups, to be used in the fight against drugs.

Later on Thursday, Mrs. Reagan went to Rome, where she will meet Pope John Paul II on Saturday for talks that will include a discussion of the drug problem.

Referring to Mrs. Reagan's efforts, Secretary of State George P. Shultz said at a news conference that "one of the most important people in this meeting is not here—Nancy Reagan."

#### MINISTERS ALSO MEET ON DRUGS

Mr. Shultz said a Friday morning discussion by foreign ministers, centered on drug production and trafficking and its connection with international terrorism. That issue has occupied leaders at the conference several times in the past, and led to a declaration on fighting terrorism that was issued at the 1984 meeting in London.

Mr. Shultz said the foreign ministers' discussions produced "a general raising of the perception on this problem."

"It was not on the agenda particularly," Mr. Shultz said, "it just emerged."

Although such statements gave the impression that the talks were spontaneous, officials indicated that delegations from several countries, including the United States and Britain, arrived prepared to tackle the issue.

Mr. Speakes said the President told a staff meeting afterward, "Never have I seen my summit partners so united and determined on a single subject."

#### THATCHER EXPRESSES ALARM

British officials described Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher as being particularly alarmed by the rapid spread of drug trafficking. The Prime Minister, they said, pointed out that production and seizures of heroin and cocaine were at a record high and said the price of heroin was higher than the price of gold.

Officials said Mrs. Thatcher painted a decidedly gloomier picture about the world drug problem than Mr. Reagan, who seemed optimistic that some progress was being made in the fight against traffickers.

A British official said an idea was raised to have the seven-nation economic meeting next year, planned for Tokyo, formally take up the drug problem, just as the 1984 economic meeting in London dealt with terrorism.

Italian officials said Italy's Foreign Minister, Giulio Andreotti, describing drug abuse a scourge "worse than war," called on the

seven nations to increase cooperation among lawmakers and police officials, to improve education efforts to teach people about the dangers of drugs and to increase aid to organizations like the United Nations that are fighting drug trafficking. ●

### SALUTE TO INDIANA'S RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEM

#### HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, any celebration of the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration would not be complete without an account of Indiana's role in taking electricity to rural America.

The Indiana General Assembly first approved the Indiana Rural Electric Membership Act on May 5, 1935, 6 days before the Presidential proclamation that established a nationwide program.

Indiana's law became the model for other States passing rural electric legislation. I. Harvey Hull, general manager of Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative at that time, spearheaded the effort to bring electricity to rural Indiana.

Hull's quest for rural power may have begun when his own farm was electrified in 1922. By 1933, he was discussing with congressional leaders the feasibility of a farm cooperative taking electricity to rural area. The following year, 1934, Hull and other Farm Bureau personnel traveled to Europe for an international cooperative conference. When he learned that 65 percent of rural Norway and Sweden could be electrified, compared to only 10 percent in America, Hull decided that Indiana could do as well and he began drafting the necessary legislation.

Immediately after Gov. Paul V. McNutt signed the Indiana REMC Act, the Farm Bureau board created the Indiana Statewide REMC [now REC] to promote local electric co-ops and provide them with various services.

Men and women from throughout the State volunteered their time and powers of persuasion to sign their neighbors up for electricity. All it took was \$5 and you were a member of the rural electric cooperative.

Today, Hoosier REMC's have a total membership of more than 323,000. The largest REMC system in the State is Morgan County REMC with 19,910 members; the smallest is Newton County REMC with 1,312.

In the past 50 years Hoosier REMC's have built 48,566 miles of line, enough to circle the Earth twice. In 1935, only 11 percent of Indiana's rural areas had central station electricity. Today, 99 percent have power.

Being energized is perhaps the fondest memory of many rural folks in Indiana. "It improved our lives 100 percent," one member said. "It was just like a new world. Just like opening the door into something that you never expected to have," another echoed strongly.

Yet they had it, thanks to Hull and the other Indiana pioneers who acted on their dreams of electrifying the countryside. And 50 years later, Indiana statewide is still out front in service to the people of Indiana.

Congratulations on your 50th birthday. May you have many, many more. ●

### HONORING FRANK PASQUERILLA

#### HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, on May 19 the Sons of Italy will honor Mr. Frank Pasquerilla in Johnstown, PA. Frank Pasquerilla's service to his family, his community, and his Nation are in the highest American tradition, and symbolize what our great Nation stands for in the world.

Frank was born in Johnstown and raised by old Italian traditions stressing a close family and devotion to community, family, and religious strength. At age 12 he was selling newspapers, as a teenager he was working as a short-order cook, as an adult he owned the building where he sold papers as a child.

In thinking about Frank Pasquerilla, I am reminded of a quote used by Senator Robert Kennedy during his 1968 Presidential campaign. "Some men see things as they are and ask why; others dream of things as they should be, and ask why not?"

In his personal life, Frank Pasquerilla embodies the American dream. An individual who made his own way, reached success, and has used his success to help others achieve their own potential.

In his public life, I have worked with Frank Pasquerilla on project after project to benefit the community. Saving Bethlehem Steel in Johnstown. Attracting Metropolitan Life to the area. Keeping the Flight Service Station at the Johnstown-Cambria County Airport. Not a year has gone by that I have not been involved with Frank Pasquerilla in some community project; and not a year has gone by that we have not been successful.

In his private, unpublicized contributions to the community, he contributes his time to church and community activities, and uses the facilities at his disposal such as a corporate jet to transport patients and injured individ-



uals to hospitals and to help the community leaders travel to promote Johnstown and attract jobs to the area.

There will be a long, and very deserved list of accomplishments, positions attained, and signs of success noted at this dinner. But having known Frank Pasquerilla, and having enjoyed the opportunity to work with him, I am confident in closing by saying that what we appreciate most, and what we join in honoring Frank for tonight, is because of the individual he is, his friendship, his kindness, his consideration, and his thoughtfulness.

In participating in this tribute, I hope we are saying a proper appreciation for those qualities that we have all enjoyed so much and benefited from over many years. We look forward to continuing the partnership for many more years. ●

#### CASE STUDY OF A FAILED LOAN: IDEAL WIRE'S COSTLY COLLAPSE

**HON. DAVID DREIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the RECORD part 3 of a five-part investigative series, published in the May 7 issue of *Newsday*, on improper loan practices involving Long Island small businesses which were financed by the Federal Small Business Administration. I recognize that it is impossible for the SBA to insure that all of its loans are being used for legitimate business purposes. However, I think that Congress has a particular responsibility to see that the taxpayer's hard-earned dollars are being used to benefit the nation as a whole, rather than just a select few individuals—whether it be through improper dealings, agency mismanagement, or a lack of legislative foresight.

[From *Newsday*, May 7, 1985]

#### CASE STUDY OF A FAILED LOAN: IDEAL WIRE'S COSTLY COLLAPSE

Two phone calls made by the right people show how politics and money can facilitate Small Business Administration loans on Long Island.

The first call was placed late in 1982 by former Suffolk Republican leader Robert Curcio Sr., paid consultant to a Holbrook company seeking a \$500,000 SBA loan. Curcio called Peter Neglia, the Reagan administration's new SBA regional director and son of an old political contact. Curcio wanted to know why the SBA wasn't making the loan.

Neglia made the second call. He said he phoned one of his subordinates, Walter Leavitt, the SBA's top official on Long Island, and asked the same question—why wasn't the company getting the loan?

After Neglia's call, records show, Leavitt and another senior SBA official overruled

an SBA loan officer and approved the loan to Curcios' client, the Ideal Wire Manufacturing and Coating Corp., whose president, Walter R. Lehmann, had a history of failed businesses and unpaid debts.

Curcios' services didn't come cheap. *Newsday* has traced a series of checks totaling \$28,000 issued by Ideal Wire to Curcio—checks described by Lehmann as payment for Curcio's help in getting the SBA loan. These payments were not disclosed to the SBA as required by federal law. Leavitt said that the sum was excessive for SBA consulting—"out of sight," in his words—and that the SBA would have investigated if the proper disclosure had been made.

The transaction also was costly in another way—for the taxpayers and dozens of companies, large and small, that did business with Ideal Wire. Ideal made four payments on the loan after the SBA approved it in January, 1983, then defaulted with \$498,512 of principal still owed. The company filed for protection from creditors under the Bankruptcy Act. Besides the SBA debt, Ideal's collapse left behind \$158,104 in unpaid taxes and \$527,447 in unsecured debts to creditors, the companies that sold materials or services to Ideal.

The Ideal Wire story provides a case study of a failed SBA loan that mirrors some of the arguments in the current national debate over whether Congress should go along with the administration's efforts to abolish the agency.

SBA critics charge that the agency has approved loans to companies with questionable financial backgrounds; that some loans have been influenced by politics or payoffs; and that banks and other financial institutions that fund SBA-guaranteed loans don't always screen applicants carefully because 90 percent of any loss is covered by the government.

The Ideal Wire loan came from an SBA-certified lender, the Money Store of New York, which screened the initial application and recommended it to the SBA for approval. The Money Store of New York was then headed by Steven Gurian. He also is president of the Long Island Development Corp., a quasi-governmental corporation set up by Nassau and Suffolk counties to facilitate SBA and other government loans for Long Island businesses. *Newsday* reported Sunday that Gurian has had consulting deals and other financial involvement with borrowers described as improper by county and SBA officials.

Court and SBA records, internal Ideal Wire records, bank memos, and interviews disclose a number of irregularities that pose ethical questions about the Ideal Wire loan.

Gurian has acknowledged that he knew, and failed to tell the SBA, that Curcio had been a consultant to Ideal on the loan. He also concedes that Curcio's role was not disclosed on the government forms as required by law. And, *Newsday* has learned, a year after the Ideal loan, Gurian and Curcio were trying to form an SBA-certified lending company of their own. Curcio, however, says that he abandoned that plan when he learned that *Newsday* was looking into Gurian.

The Money Store and SBA approved the loan despite public records that raise questions about the collapse of Lehmann's previous company, Ideal Fence Supply Co. Inc. Records show that in 1981 the company claimed an inability to pay \$250,000 in debts. During the year before the company failed, records show that Lehmann and his father took \$459,829 more than their sala-

ries out of the company. They explained the extra money as loan repayments. The bankruptcy file contains no further documentation of such loans. A judge eventually dismissed the bankruptcy petition because of Lehmann's failure to provide the required financial reports and reorganization plan for the company.

When the Money Store and SBA approved the \$500,000 loan to Ideal Wire, Lehmann's personal credit rating was so poor that court records show he had to make his 20-year-old daughter the company's sole stockholder. He had an unsatisfied \$168,000 judgment against him, and an official of his main bank, Long Island Trust Co., said in an internal memo that Lehmann's personal guaranty on loans "had no value."

Although SBA officials say the loan is secured by solid collateral—Lehmann's house, some vacant property and Ideal's machinery and inventory—other documents raise doubts. Lehmann moved Ideal's machinery and inventory to a suburb of Buffalo without notifying the SBA, and Leavitt has conceded that the SBA probably won't recover anything from it. Leavitt said SBA efforts to foreclose on Lehmann's real estate have been snagged—court records show competing claims from another debtor and a counter-suit by Idea.

In that suit, Lehmann charges that most of the SBA money he thought he was getting to revive his business was instead illegally diverted by the Money Store to pay debts Lehmann owed to banks. SBA rules forbid granting loans for what they call a "ball out"—in other words, to "pay off creditors who are in a position to sustain a loss." Gurian denied that was done, but records show that during the loan closing, two checks were issued to satisfy old bank debts; \$162,212 to Long Island Trust and \$50,000 to Barclay's Bank.

Lehmann has not responded to numerous phone calls and a letter requesting an interview, but he has given his version of events in court depositions and testimony during the ongoing Ideal Wire bankruptcy proceeding. Records show Lehmann came to the loan-closing with Curcio but without an attorney. Lehmann said he expected to get most of the money "for new inventory and equipment and working capital for Ideal." However, he said, "as soon as I signed over the check from the SBA, the Money Store took its fees and then oversaw the passing out of checks to various prior secured creditors, almost totally exhausting the available funds."

Lehmann said: "As it turned out, all I received was a sort of loan consolidation, which hopelessly encumbered my property, and as no capital was transferred to Ideal, its demise was assured, thus leaving me with no income to repay these obligations."

Records of the loan-closing do not fully support that assertion, but they do show that Lehmann did not get all the money supposedly earmarked by SBA for working capital. The records show that checks totaling \$110,600 were issued for machinery and equipment for Ideal and that \$386,840 was deposited into an Ideal bank account for working capital. However, the checks to clear the old bank debts, totaling \$212,212, were then drawn from that account. Lehmann said the Money Store's lawyer, Roslyn Goldmacher, "stated to me words to the effect, 'This won't leave much for Ideal, will it?'" Goldmacher has not returned repeated calls from *Newsday*.

Gurian said he first met Curcio when the former Republican leader, who is a real

estate broker, approached him about the Ideal Wire loan. "He represented himself as their business consultant," Gurian said.

Federal law allows SBA loan applicants to hire consultants to help them get loans, but their identity and the fee must be disclosed on the application, and the SBA must make a ruling that the fee is reasonable in comparison to work done by the consultant. Leavitt said the SBA would almost certainly have rejected a fee as high as Curcio's. The SBA also prohibits contingent fees in which the size of the fee depend on the success of the application.

Gurian said he told Curcio about these rules: "I warned him just like I warn everybody else . . . right in front of the client. The client has to sign in three places, and if he puts you down as a business consultant, nothing wrong with it, perfectly all right, but then you must fill in a compensation agreement form which says this is what you did, this is how long it took you, this is what you normally charge to your best customer . . . Then the government approves or disapproves."

Gurian was shown copies of the \$28,000 in Ideal checks to Curcio. Two of them, totaling \$13,000 are marked "consultant for SBA," the others do not bear any notation as to their purpose. One check for \$4,000 bounced for insufficient funds. The checks began in August, 1982, and continued into April, 1983, spanning the period in which the loan was considered and approved by the Money Store and SBA. Ideal's books for August, 1983, show an additional \$500 payment to Curcio.

Of the checks, Gurian said: "If the FBI picks this up, or the U.S. Attorney's office picks this up, they have a basis for going against him on a fraudulent statement in order to induce us to make the loan." Gurian added: "I knew that he [Curcio] had received a large amount of money in comparison to what a business consultant would normally charge or have approved by the SBA. I had no idea it was this amount."

Why hadn't he required that the application disclose Curcio's role? Gurian replied: "I'll tell you something, you know—I don't want to know. I'm not the keeper of the keys. I'm here as an advocate of a small businessman. If I had to be the keeper of the morals of all the small businessmen and what they do and how they do it. I couldn't."

The SBA's Leavitt said Gurian's silence was improper in view of the close working relationship between the Money Store and the SBA. "I don't agree with him," Leavitt said. "Technically, he's not a policeman. But we're partners, and one partner should tell the other partner what's going on."

Newsday tried to interview high-ranking officials of the Money Store—the largest maker of SBA-guaranteed loans in the country—about the Ideal Wire loan and others issued by its New York subsidiary formerly headed by Gurian. Gurian retired as president of the Money Store of New York last year but says he remains a paid consultant to the parent company.

Alan Turteltaub, president of the Money Store, initially agreed to an interview. But then he broke two appointments and failed to return several phone calls. Then he said that no interviews would be allowed, that the company would only answer written questions, and that he would not comment further.

Lehmann's court papers allege that the Ideal Wire loan is under federal investigation, and Newsday has independently con-

firmed that federal prosecutors are looking into that loan and others made by the Money Store of New York.

Curcio, Ideal's consultant, is a veteran of Suffolk Republican politics but has not been publicly active in recent years. He became Babylon GOP leader in 1964 and county leader two years later. In 1967 Newsday published a series of stories on Islip land and zoning scandals that involved some of Curcio's closest political allies. In that years' elections, the GOP lost three towns—Islip, Babylon and Huntington—and the party ousted Curcio as chairman.

Curcio said he has continued attending political affairs and through them became friends with Joseph Neglia, the father of Peter Neglia. The elder Neglia is a Republican district leader in Brooklyn. "I'd go to the Brooklyn dinners; they'd invite me. That's how I met Joe. . . . We're old friends." He said their friendship goes back at least 15 years.

Curcio said he couldn't recall any details of his phone conversation with Peter Neglia about the Ideal Wire loan. Neglia, who has been promoted to acting SBA chief of staff, confirmed that Curcio called him about the loan and that he called Leavitt to ask him about the loan and that he called Leavitt to ask what was the problem. But Neglia said he never pressured his subordinates to approve the loan.

SBA records show that loan officer Frank Guarino had rejected the Ideal loan for "lack of reasonable assurance of ability to repay loan (and other obligations) from earnings."

Curcio said his consulting work for Ideal Wire involved more than just the SBA loan. "I did a million things for this guy over a three- or four-year period," he said, including taking Lehmann to private lending institutions and trying to find investors for the company. Curcio said that at his suggestion, he and Lehmann and their wives went to a Republican testimonial dinner for Neglia; Ideal records show the company paid \$250 for tickets.

During a hearing, Jules Speciner, the lawyer handling the bankruptcy case, asked Lehmann under oath about Curcio's role. Lehmann replied: "He was an adviser for—during the period I was looking for an SBA loan."

"What kind of advice did he give you?" Speciner asked.

"Packager, a go-between, between me and the SBA or Money Store structure, as an adviser," Lehmann said.

Later in his testimony, however, Lehmann added: "I think this was an ongoing thing for other things. It was not only for the SBA."

SBA officials defended their handling of the loan and said they expected to recover all of the loss from collateral. "We felt that based on the information submitted, the projections seemed reasonable, and the fact that the previous business went under doesn't mean it will be repeated," Leavitt said. "We felt we were pretty well secured and he had a reasonable chance of making it."

The collateral is Lehmann's East Islip home, which he testified is worth about \$300,000, and some vacant industrial land in Holbrook, which he valued at about \$95,000. The SBA also holds a lien on the company's machinery and equipment.

But for now, the collateral situation is confused. Last year, Leavitt said, SBA officials were surprised to discover that Lehmann, without notifying the SBA or bank-

ruptcy court, had suddenly moved all of Ideal's property to Tonawanda, a Buffalo suburb. "Over the weekend, he moved everything he owned," Leavitt said. There is an Ideal Fence Co. office in Buffalo, and a woman who answered the phone confirmed that Walter Lehmann worked there. He did not return calls.

Leavitt said he was not familiar with Lehmann's Buffalo activities. He added, though, that the SBA probably would not recover anything on the machinery because Long Island Trust holds the right to collect the first \$150,000 from any liquidation sale. Lehmann has debts to the bank stemming from the collapses of Ideal Fence on Long Island and Starfish Marine, an earlier Lehmann business that also failed.

Leavitt said he was confident, however, that the SBA would make out well in the resale of Lehmann's house and real estate. But court records show that foreclosure attempts have been complicated by a lien on the property, also held by Long Island Trust. Leavitt said he did not know when the case would be resolved.

Curcio and Gurian said their efforts last year to form an SBA lending company of their own had nothing to do with the Ideal Wire loan. Gurian said they wanted to form a small business investment corporation, a form of licensed SBA lender that makes loans combining SBA and private funds.

As part of their efforts, Curcio said, he went to Suffolk County Executive Peter Coahalan and asked that Gurian be named an unsalaried financial adviser to the county. Gurian said he thought that such a title would enhance his chances of getting SBA approval for the new investment corporation. But the county appointment never came through.

Gurian said he had been seeking at least \$3 million in investment capital for his joint venture with the former Suffolk GOP leader. "Curcio suggested that he would raise the funds because he had heavy hitters in his entourage," Gurian said. Both men said no money was ever raised. Curcio said: "I tried to put some people together and I put an awful lot of time in on the thing, and when I heard that Gurian was being investigated [by Newsday] I stopped pursuing it . . . I certainly didn't want people that I was approaching to make an investment to be embarrassed." ●

## RECOGNITION OF CARES

### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this month Lucas County, my home county, is recognizing one of its finest civic organizations. Its name is Toledo-Lucas County CARES. The acronym, ever-so fitting, stands for chemical abuse reduced through education and services. CARES is a coalition of concerned citizens working within Lucas County to reduce chemical abuse among youth.

Formed in 1982, as a result of the alarming increase in the level of drug and alcohol abuse among our communities' young people, CARES facilitates the development, implementa-



tion, and evaluation of countywide efforts to reduce the drug and alcohol problem through the application of prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs. The organization is chaired by volunteers from the Junior League of Toledo, Inc., with staff support from the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.

CARES has been tremendously successful because parents, educators, service providers, law enforcement officials, concerned citizens, and young people themselves have come together for the common good. Our community is a better place because of CARES and the people who make it work. On behalf of all the people of Ohio's Ninth District, I offer CARES the congratulations, best wishes, and appreciation of a grateful community. ●

#### CONGRESS WANTS THE PRESIDENT TO PRODUCE A NICARAGUA POLICY

**HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, on April 28 the New York Times ran a very thoughtful editorial on our Nicaragua debate. As the Times points out, the administration does not have a Nicaragua policy, and the actions it is taking will not lead to the achievement of the objectives it professes to be pursuing.

Pressure is a tactic, not a policy. What is our policy? What do we want, and what price are we prepared to pay to get it? Does it make sense to seek the overthrow of a government, when the means that we are prepared to employ will not accomplish that objective, but will instead work against other objectives that we should be seeking, such as a political opening in Nicaragua and a diplomatic settlement in Central America? As the Times asks, "Where are the lists of American demands, distinguishing between intolerable threats to our security, justifying war, and lesser interests to be sought with lesser sanctions or rewards?"

Congress "has not rejected a President's policy," the Times says. "It asks that he produce one." Mr. Speaker, I agree with that. If the President will seek a bipartisan consensus, based on full and real consultation, behind a policy that makes sense, the Congress will support him. Meanwhile, it continues to be our obligation to reject funding for the Contras—an unwise tactic that would not achieve the objectives we would be seeking if we had a policy.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1985]

#### VIETNAM IN AMERICA

To the cry of "No More Vietnams," the United States has tied itself into knots over

Nicaragua. The President wants a virtual declaration of war against the Sandinistas—no more piecemeal humiliations by Soviet proxies. Congress, in a stunning demurrer, says no more piecemeal investments of prestige in a war we're unwilling to send American boys to finish.

Some of the Vietnam echoes are evoked by the calendar. It is 20 years to the day since American ground troops went into battle in Vietnam, and 10 years since their final ignominious withdrawal. But there's a simpler explanation for our present ambivalence: ignorance. Americans, even those in authority, are obviously unsure about the conditions and stakes in Nicaragua. Where the facts seem so perplexing, how much easier to try the case by analogy.

For Congress, the overriding lesson of Vietnam is do less: sign no blank checks for warmaking. It is not convinced that the Sandinistas pose a threat justifying war. And if they did, it sees no plausible plan for overthrowing them.

For the Administration, the lesson is do more. Here it is, as rendered by Secretary of State Shultz: "Broken promises. Communist dictatorship. Refugees. Widened Soviet influence, this time near our very borders. Here is your parallel between Vietnam and Central America." He says the failure in Vietnam not only betrayed the people of Indochina but led Congress to hobble the President's authority, thus emboldening the Russians and "destabilizing" the globe.

These readings of history are not all wrong or irrelevant. But they are woefully oversimplified. Americans did not need Vietnam to learn the nature of Communism. They did not go into Vietnam to diminish Soviet influence but what they ignorantly thought was China's. And just what was it that cast so much doubt on America's wisdom and power, restraint or excess?

Nicaragua is closer than Vietnam, and arguably a more vivid American interest. But it is in no sense a Soviet power. Precisely because it is nearby, America could quickly snuff out any real security threat. Nicaragua's Marxists may yearn to spread revolution, but their opportunities to do so depend more on American behavior than Soviet ambitions. Like Vietnam, Nicaragua may be too heavily armed for its size, but it has had much more reason to fear invasion.

The ultimate lessons of Vietnam for all Americans should be evident. This country will not effectively wage war unless it understands the reason for the pain. Even a hesitant resort to force creates uncontrollable imperatives. It soon requires exaggerating the stakes, then destroys the balance between ends and means and finally forecloses diplomacy and compromise. When America stands in peril, that price has to be paid. Where less-than-vital interests are at stake, the path away from force needs to be as clearly marked as the path in.

For an astute appreciation of America's interests and dilemmas in Nicaragua, read the report in today's New York Times Magazine by Mario Vargas Llosa, the Peruvian novelist.

"The kind of massive, and bloody, military intervention that will be needed to overthrow the Sandinistas will not result in a democracy," he says. "Only a dictatorship can impose order in a country devastated by terrorism and civil war. To maintain the existing fragile freedoms under the present regime, the only choice for the opposition is to reach some kind of an agreement with the Sandinistas. Although the regime has traveled far down the road toward totalitari-

anism, the challenges and difficulties it faces are an inducement to compromise."

That may be wrong. So may be the author's judgment that the Soviet Union has decided against paying the price of taking Nicaragua under its wing, like Cuba; or that Nicaragua's revolution looks a lot like Mexico's. But where are the comparably clear-eyed analyses by the United States Government? Where are the lists of American demands, distinguishing between intolerable threats to our security, justifying war, and lesser interests to be sought with lesser sanctions or rewards?

The lesson of Vietnam is simply that, when in doubt, look a dozen times before leaping. Congress, which cannot have its own diplomacy, has not rejected a President's policy. In its justified confusion, it asks that he produce one. ●

#### JANE BOECKMANN HONORED

**HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader of our community, Mrs. Jane Boeckmann. On May 17 of this year, she concludes her term as president of the Panorama City/Sepulveda Chamber of Commerce.

During her tenure, as the result of her tremendous talent, dedication, and effort, the chamber of commerce has experienced great growth.

Mrs. Boeckmann's contributions to the community extend way beyond the chamber of commerce. Her seemingly infinite energy has bettered the quality of life for all who live and work in the San Fernando Valley.

As founder, publisher, and editor-in-chief of Valley magazine, she has given valley residents a forum for discussing issues of particular interest to them. As a philanthropist, humanitarian, religious and civic leader, wife, and mother, she has been an example for all of us.

She was cofounder of the San Fernando Valley Cultural Foundation. From 1982 through 1984, she served as honorary mayor of the San Fernando Valley. And in the past, she has been vice president of the San Fernando Valley Arts Council, director of World Opportunities, member of the board of trustees for California Lutheran College, and served on countless commissions and committees.

She has earned many well-deserved awards; among them are the Patriotic Citizen of the Year Award, State of California Mother of the Year, and Newsmaker of the Year, just to name a few.

It is my honor to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Mrs. Jane Boeckmann, a tremendous asset to the community and a truly remarkable woman. ●

## LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF NUTRITION

## HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with a number of our colleagues in cosponsoring the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1985. Congressman MACKEY, Congressman BROWN of California, and I introduced a similar bill last year.

These bills result from hearings held over the past 6 years by the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, which I chair, and by the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture, chaired by Mr. BROWN. H.R. 2436 creates no new Federal activities in nutrition monitoring and related research, but seeks to organize the numerous activities presently being conducted in a piecemeal fashion into a more effective, priority program. Thus, the program would make more effective use of current resources and improve the contribution that nutrition monitoring information and research can make.

As a result of previous hearings, the Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS] and the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] finally submitted the long-overdue implementation plan for a National Nutrition Monitoring System to the Congress. That plan fails to identify a number of essential factors such as a structure to coordinate independent activities, allocation of agency responsibility, and the availability of personnel and other resources needed to accomplish the tasks involved. Because of these deficiencies, the goal of the plan, to carry out the first coordinated Nationwide Food Consumption Survey [NFCS] and National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey [NHANES], cannot now be accomplished in 1987. In addition, the report on the nutritional status of our people, which was to be submitted to the Congress in November 1984 has been delayed for at least 1 year.

The following excerpts from testimony at our committee's June 1984 hearing demonstrates the need for this legislation:

Presently the need for a comprehensive nutrition monitoring system is not being met even though many of the elements of the system exist.

There is little practically-oriented epidemiologic research to develop shorter and cheaper methods of monitoring nutritional status, food consumption, nutrition knowledge, and food scarcity suitable for use by states, localities, and others needing such methods.

In addition, a coordinated effort among the various agencies would enhance standardization of data collection, analysis and

reporting, thereby facilitating comparison and interpretation of the surveys and also providing a more comprehensive picture of the nutritional status of the population.

Currently most information we have is 6-10 years old, and therefore is not very useful in identifying current problems, such as the increasing incidence of hunger and malnutrition resulting from the strains of the recent economic recession and cutbacks in Federal food assistance programs.

Nutrition surveys must be continuous, and they must be accountable to policymakers and the public. Even the President's Task Force on Food Assistance made this point. Yet the current system does not ensure continuity or accountability.

In addition, without this legislation, the Congress has no means to evaluate the effectiveness of the executive branch in carrying out nutrition monitoring activities. Last February, Congressman GEORGE BROWN and I wrote the Secretary of Health and Human Services to request a summary of fiscal year 1985 funds expended and the fiscal year 1986 budget request for nutrition monitoring activities by each agency within the Department. The response from DHHS stated, "It is difficult to respond to your request for dollar amounts spent on nutrition monitoring activities because often costs are contained not in one but several line items within the DHHS agency's budgets." The bill we are introducing today will make it possible for the Congress and all Federal agencies to better understand expenditures for this important activity.

We can no longer afford a nutrition monitoring system that provides data 6 to 10 years after the fact. Nutrition and health indicators are as important, if not more so, than current economic indicators. What we do in the area of food, nutrition, and health requires timeliness. I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this bill and working toward its early passage. ●

## POSTSCRIPT TO BITBURG

## HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a postscript to the President's visit to Bitburg Cemetery. It is too late to change his deplorable action. But I want to make clear that when President Reagan laid a wreath at Bitburg, he did not represent the American people.

Mr. Reagan claims that he went to Germany seeking reconciliation. But my question is: With whom does he want to reconcile—with modern-day Germany, or with the Nazis of World War II? By placing a wreath at Bitburg Cemetery, President Reagan in effect, honored the Nazi killers and the Germans who massacred American prisoners. The American people are

anxious to mend our fences with Germany of 1985, but public outcry made clear that going to Bitburg would not accomplish this.

Last week, President Reagan claimed that it would be a sign of weakness to change his itinerary in the face of public pressure. That, to me, is an incredible statement. It is not weak to admit you are wrong; rather, it takes strength and courage to publicly correct a mistake. The controversy surrounding the Bitburg trip was an expression of the will of the American people. The President should take seriously such public pressure and respond with sensitivity.

When I visited Poland several years ago, I made sure I went to Auschwitz. I wanted to see firsthand the legacy of the Nazis. That trip made clear to me the importance of remembering the Holocaust and the unspeakable horror of the Nazi genocide. Even as we improve relations with Germany of 1985, we can never forget what happened 40 years ago.

It was an affront to the American people that the President felt it was more important to please the Germans than the thousands of American veterans, Gold Star Mothers, and Jews everywhere who asked him not to go to Bitburg. Never forgetting the Holocaust means never honoring those who tortured and killed millions. President Reagan's itinerary was not a question of strength or weakness, but a moral issue of good and evil.

I am indebted to my friend, Rabbi Manuel Poliakov, of Baltimore, for his wise counsel regarding the Bitburg trip. It was he who pointed out to me that the President was not representing the American people when he went to Bitburg. Based on the reaction of the public and here in Congress, I agree. I, and many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, wrote to President Reagan urging him to cancel his trip to Bitburg Cemetery. The response of the American people was overwhelming in their opposition to the Bitburg event. Elie Wiesel eloquently pointed out that the President's place is with the victims, not the perpetrators, of the Holocaust. I am personally outraged that all our pleas could not make President Reagan change his itinerary. Although it is too late to change his action, I want the record to show that the spirit of America was not with him on that day in Bitburg. ●



STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN  
TED WEISS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY  
OF THE APOLLO  
THEATRE

**HON. TED WEISS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, this is the 50th anniversary year of Harlem's renowned Apollo Theatre. On this occasion I want to pay tribute to the Apollo for its contribution to 20th century American culture. I wish the Apollo continued success as its doors open once again to established and especially new artists as well as appreciative audiences.

The Apollo Theatre's greatest accomplishment was to bring music by black artists to the attention of the public and the record industry. The Apollo was a vehicle for artists who otherwise had limited access to the entertainment world. We are grateful to the Apollo for presenting people who were not allowed to appear elsewhere because of racial discrimination and for providing the necessary support for large numbers of talented black musicians, vocalists, comics, and dancers who brought us the best in popular entertainment. After the civil rights laws eased segregation in the entertainment industry and black stars were welcomed in "downtown" theatres and nightclubs, the Apollo continued to provide them a special home as well as a showcase for newcomers.

The list of Apollo performers reads as a "Who's Who" in American music and as a lesson in American cultural history. The theatre was built in 1912, and by the 1930's, it became the foremost talent showcase for black entertainers. Blues greats Duke Ellington, Louis Armstrong, and Ethel Waters have graced its stage. During the 1940's, its big band talent included Count Basie, and Earl Hines. Out of this era emerged Miles Davis, Charlie Parker, Sarah Vaughan, and Billie Holiday, among others.

Be-bop and rhythm and blues dominated the Apollo's stage after World War II. It presented the sounds of Charlie Parker, Dizzy Gillespie, and Bud Powell. The 1950's brought rock and roll, and audiences were treated to the music of Bo Diddley, the Drifters, and the Dominoes. The Temptations, Diana Ross, the Supremes, and Stevie Wonder were all a part of the Motown sound that was headlined by the Apollo in the 1960's.

The Apollo's famous amateur night was the stomping ground for talent agents and members of the entertainment business. In the 1970's the Jackson Five competed in Amateur Night. Ella Fitzgerald, James Brown, Dionne Warwick, and Stephanie Mills credit the Apollo with launching their ca-

reers. The Apollo offered hope to young people who dreamed of show business success. For many, those dreams were fulfilled.

In 1976, the Apollo closed its doors to live performances. This vital cultural resource went under when it was forced to compete with cultural facilities seating large audiences and sophisticated, inexpensive entertainment alternatives—television, radio, records and tapes.

Now, after a change in ownership the Apollo is reopening. The theatre building received landmark status in 1983, and has been refurbished. It is in a new and stronger financial position with support from local and Federal agencies and the private sector. On May 20th, the reopening is being publicly celebrated with a national television special.

It is heartening to see that the Apollo and its progeny are receiving such well-deserved attention and best wishes. I am confident that this theatre will continue to contribute to the cultural life of this Nation and continue to launch the careers of talented young people. All of New York City, indeed the entire nation, welcomes the rebirth of the Apollo.●

**ARMS CONTROL AND NUCLEAR  
TESTING**

**HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Arms Control, of which I am a member, has been considering legislation which would urge the ratification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty [TTBT] and instruct the President to immediately propose negotiations on a comprehensive test ban [CTB]. In this regard, I commend to my colleagues the following statement by Don Kerr, director of Los Alamos National Laboratory, who testified before the subcommittee on May 8.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I am Donald M. Kerr, Director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to discuss the issues of arms control and test limitations with you; I hope that what I say will assist in understanding this difficult and important subject. Our Laboratory is run by the University of California for the Department of Energy. We have a staff of 8,000 employees. The first nuclear and thermonuclear weapons were designed at Los Alamos. Over two-thirds of the nuclear weapons currently in the US stockpile were designed by our Laboratory. We know the tremendous destructive power of these weapons, and we have long hoped that the world's leaders would find ways to reach effective arms control agreements. We were the pioneers of technical means of verification, including the ground-based Vela detectors followed by the space based Vela. I also, however, bear

the responsibility of personally signing certification documents that state that the weapons we design will work and that they have appropriate safety features. That responsibility weighs heavily.

For three decades, bans or limitations on testing of nuclear weapons have been one of the most frequently suggested and widely supported forms of nuclear arms control. Yet, testing restraints constitute a highly technical approach to arms control. And they have often been advocated as an alternative to political approaches and agreements when this avenue appeared to be closed by political controversy or concern over military-strategic problems.

At this moment of considerable concern about the future of arms control, many voices from within the United States and outside are encouraging the US Government to move ahead on restraining nuclear weapons testing—by ratifying the Threshold Test Ban Treaty (TTBT) and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosives Treaty (PNET), by reopening negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB), and perhaps even by moving boldly in advance of nuclear arms control negotiation with a unilateral moratorium on US nuclear weapon tests. H.J. Res. 3, which urges the President to submit the TTBT and PNET to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification, and to propose to the Soviet Union the immediate resumption of negotiations on a CTB, appears to indicate congressional support for this approach. However, nuclear test bans and testing moratoria could have an adverse effect on US national security, and it is not certain that they can significantly advance the cause of nuclear arms control or be a substitute for direct reductions of nuclear weapons.

In the 1970s, the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosives Treaty were negotiated. The PNET included an extensive protocol on verification methods to assure compliance, negotiated with scientific input from both sides. This protocol has not entered into force since the treaty remains unratified. However, compliance with the PNET has not been questioned. On the other hand, Soviet compliance with the 150 kiloton (kt) limit on underground nuclear weapon tests specified in the TTBT has been hotly debated within the United States for some time. The United States has depended upon seismic measurements from remote stations to monitor Soviet compliance with the 150 kt limit. These measurements are sometimes ambiguous and have led to controversy about Soviet behavior under the TTBT.

**REASONS FOR NUCLEAR TESTING**

As long as we rely on nuclear weapons, we must test them. Our nuclear weapon test program is essential in designing, engineering, manufacturing, maintaining, and certifying weapons.

**Certification**

Certification is a guarantee from the nuclear weapons design laboratories that weapons will perform to specifications throughout their stockpile life, in peacetime as well as in war. Equally important, it is a promise that they will be safe and resistant to unauthorized attempts to use them by terrorists or others.

**Nuclear research and development**

Nuclear tests are essential for determining the proper functioning of nuclear explosives. Calculations do not suffice, and there is no way experimentally to simulate the

total performance of a nuclear weapon. Without testing, no new designs ought to be put into stockpile. In some cases, however, existing designs can be adopted for use in other delivery systems. We are concerned that, given real life pressures and fallible human nature, we might occasionally stockpile new designs or inadequately reasoned changes in old ones. Serious unreliability could result.

Of course, preventing the development of new generations of nuclear weapons—which are generally viewed as inherently more dangerous, destructive and destabilizing—is precisely what the proponents of testing limits have as their objective. However, testing has been and continues to be necessary for reducing the dangers and destructiveness of nuclear weapons. Indeed, testing is necessary for advancing our knowledge in desirable areas, without at the same time taking unreasonable risks. Nuclear testing allows us to make nuclear weapons safer, and to improve controls to prevent or deny unauthorized use. It allows us to improve design efficiency and to reduce the cost and special nuclear material requirements of warheads, as well as to design weapons to reduce collateral damage. And nuclear effects tests, primarily carried out by the Defense Nuclear Agency, contribute significantly to our ability to study the effects of nuclear weapons on our weapons systems, as well as on our command, communications, reconnaissance and other assets. This knowledge is essential for responding to the threat posed by Soviet offensive nuclear systems by, among other means, hardening our command, control, communications and intelligence (C<sup>3</sup>I) capabilities. We increasingly rely on such capabilities to avoid war, to manage crises, to maintain the credibility of our deterrent and, in the event of war, to assure our defense.

#### *Maintenance of the stockpile*

Nuclear testing is essential for the maintenance of the stockpile. Nuclear weapons are affected significantly by aging and obsolescence; over an extended period the materials used in warheads deteriorate physically. Expected stockpile lifetimes for warheads are typically between 15 and 25 years, but some designs have required corrective measures much sooner. In the past, new weapons usually replaced those in the stockpile before the older weapons deteriorated. But without nuclear testing, the possible effects of physical deterioration would become increasingly important.

#### *Maintenance of nuclear design capability*

Not only is nuclear testing essential to the maintenance of the nuclear stockpile, but the US nuclear weapons laboratories have maintained for years that testing programs are essential in maintaining the nuclear weapons capability of the nation. Without an experimental testing program, which challenges our nuclear weapon designers and tests their designs, we would lose our best designers. Those remaining would not be able to demonstrate the validity of their theories. This was our experience during the test moratorium. In effect, over a period of years, we would expect the technical base of knowledge and experience required for developing and maintaining weapons to dissipate and disappear.

#### *RATIFICATION OF TTBT*

The TTBT, signed in 1974, establishes a nuclear "threshold" by prohibiting tests with a yield exceeding 150 kt. The US, as I have indicated, observes the 150 kt threshold scrupulously. Within this limit, the Lab-

oratory is able to maintain the present stockpile and our nuclear design capability. Without testing over 150 kt, we can within limits undertake risk-free modifications of nuclear weapons to enhance safety, improve efficiency (yield-to-weight ratio), reduce cost, tailor effects to reduce collateral damage, and achieve other design improvements. As well, needed nuclear effects testing can be undertaken. The Laboratory can design, produce and certify new weapons with high confidence if they are 150 kt or less, or with lessening confidence if they are not larger than the threshold by approximately a factor of two (2) and if the design has been tested in the past at higher yields. The Laboratory will not be able to design and develop high-yield weapons based on designs that depart significantly from those of the past. Unless the US established new, high-yield weapons requirements, we can live with such restrictions on our own program. However, we are concerned about what the Soviets can do under the TTBT.

#### *Soviet compliance*

Under the TTBT, there is a serious potential for Soviet violations. Without knowledge of the procedures employed by the Soviets to develop and certify their weapons, and with the intrinsic uncertainties of the methodology we use to verify Soviet compliance with the Treaty, they could test at levels that might allow them to execute proof tests of the weapons believed to comprise the bulk of their stockpile or test new designs with even higher yields. Even if they conducted one or two high-yield tests every few years, it might be possible for them to develop totally new high-yield weapons. Thus, potential Soviet noncompliance with the provisions of the Treaty could create a serious asymmetry with military significance.

#### *Verification of a TTBT*

In the Protocol to the TTBT, the US and the USSR agreed:

For the Purpose of ensuring verification of compliance with the obligations of the Parties under the Treaty by national technical means, the Parties shall, on the basis of reciprocity, exchange the following data:

a. The geographic coordinates of the boundaries of each test site and of the boundaries of the geophysically distinct testing areas therein.

b. Information on the geology of the testing areas of the sites (the rock characteristics of geological formations and the basic physical properties of the rock, i.e., density, seismic velocity, water saturation, porosity and the depth of water table).

c. The geographic coordinates of underground nuclear weapon tests, after they have been conducted.

d. Yield, date, time, depth and coordinates for two nuclear weapon tests for calibration purposes from each geophysically distinct testing area where underground nuclear weapon tests have been and are to be conducted. In this connection the yield of such explosions for calibration purposes should be as near as possible to the limit defined in Article I of the Treaty and not less than one-tenth of that limit. In the case of testing areas where data are not available on two tests for calibration purposes, the data pertaining to one such test shall be exchanged, if available, and the data pertaining to the second test shall be exchanged as soon as possible after the second test having a yield in the above-mentioned range. The provisions of this Protocol shall not require the Parties to conduct tests solely for calibration purposes.

The parties agreed that these data (a, b, d) would be exchanged simultaneously with the exchange of instruments of ratification, and the data exchange provisions of the TTBT have not yet come into effect. Consequently, we do not know how valuable this geophysical data would be. But it is by no means certain, as some would have us believe, that the exchange of geophysical data upon ratification of the TTBT will reduce ambiguities about the size and site of Soviet tests, or that it will increase confidence in Soviet compliance with the provision of the TTBT. If we were certain that exchange of these data would effectively result in effective ratification, it would indeed be ironic and, I believe, insupportable to hold up verification of the TTBT on the grounds of inadequate provisions for verification. However, any possible reduction of uncertainty that might result from data exchanges and calibration shots specified in the Protocol to the TTBT would depend, in part, on our confidence in the accuracy of the data provided by the Soviets and the value of the technical data themselves. The Treaty does not provide for confirmation of the data supplied. We would have to trust the Soviets on this vital matter to a far greater degree than we have in other areas.

It has on occasion been suggested in public that Los Alamos believes that the Soviets have violated the 150 kt limit, while Livermore disagrees. Los Alamos has analyzed the compliance issue statistically, using models believed to be consistent with official positions and actions. We concluded that the issue of Soviet compliance is unresolved and, with the methods of verification that are presently available, unresolvable. In essence, the problem involves uncertainties in measurement (encompassing both the nature of statistical measurement and the amount and accuracy of data available) and the difficulties of translating these uncertainties into high-confidence conclusions about compliance. To resolve this problem, at Los Alamos and elsewhere there are explorations of improved and new verification methodologies that have the potential for increasing confidence in our ability to determine Soviet compliance with the TTBT.

#### *Would a CTB equally constrain the Soviets?*

We cannot be certain that a CTB would equally constrain the Soviets. Since we do not know the specifics of Soviet nuclear weapon design, we are simply unable to say whether they would be affected by a CTB in the same manner and to the same extent that we are. It is by no means certain that a CTB would prevent the Soviets from developing a new generation of nuclear weapons, although that would assuredly be the effect of a total testing ban on the United States. More important, it has been recognized, even by proponents of a CTB, that in the long-term some degree of testing would be necessary to assure the credibility of the deterrent. This is true, and it is quite possible that the Soviet military nuclear technology base and most of their nuclear stockpile could be preserved and maintained indefinitely with tests of a few tens of kilotons in violation of a total testing ban.

#### *Verification*

Equally important, or perhaps more important in this context, are verification uncertainties. I cannot share the view of those who agree that an effective, verifiable CTB is within our grasp. Even with monitors on Soviet soil and on-site inspections, verification of a CTB would involve considerable



uncertainties. Verification concerns with a CTB involve a different range of yields than with a TTBT. In essence, the problem of verifying a CTB is detection of relatively small seismic events and the unequivocal identification of their source. As seismic magnitude decreases, the number of naturally occurring events during any period increase dramatically. Given this fundamental fact, under a CTB even greater verification difficulties would beset us than under a TTBT, especially if we were largely dependent upon remote teleseismic monitoring.

All experts agree that there is some lower limit below which nuclear tests in hard rock cannot be detected with remote seismic monitors; the usual figures cited are one, two, or at most a few kilotons. Proponents of a CTB argue that this is sufficient to assure compliance. But it is possible to disguise tests of relatively large nuclear weapons to make them appear (to remote monitors) relatively small or as something other than a nuclear test. By exploding a device inside a hollow underground cavity, for example, most of the energy from the explosion is not "coupled" into the earth and does not initiate seismic signals. Hiding explosions in earthquakes, or using shock-mitigating materials, may confuse the issue of decoupling even further. It is conceivable to conduct an extensive nuclear test program in this way, one that would go undetected by a network of remote teleseismic monitoring stations. Further, a CTB could require a much more extensive monitoring network than now exists, because we would have to protect against the possibility of a violator conducting tests clandestinely underwater, in the atmosphere, and in outer space, as well as underground.

It is also questionable whether a CTB would significantly improve the non-proliferation regime. Domestic advocates of a strong non-proliferation policy, along with non-nuclear-weapon states, frequently argue that the failure of the superpowers to end testing provides a stimulus for other states to build weapons. They call for a CTB and point out that in the preamble to the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the nuclear-weapon states recalled their determination to seek the cessation of all test explosions.

The real and known technical costs of a CTB, then, appear more compelling than anticipated political benefits. It is certain that we must continue to test if we intend as a nation to rely upon nuclear forces in our defense posture, as we expect to do for the foreseeable future. From the technical point of view as a laboratory Director, who has responsibilities for developing the nuclear weapons in which the U.S. relies for deterrence and defense and is required annually to sign a document certifying the performance of many of the nuclear weapons in our stockpile, I have difficulty foreseeing conditions coming into existence that would allow me to support a comprehensive testing ban. My judgment, the principle reasons behind which I have attempted to offer you today, reflects the accumulated experience of the weapons laboratories during and since the 1958-61 moratorium.●

## SOVIET JEWRY

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1985

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for hosting this special order on this crucial human rights issue: the plight of Soviet Jews. In addition, I would like to commend Mr. GILMAN for his leadership and sponsorship of House Resolution 127, a resolution expressing congressional support for Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this worthy piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker on May 5, 1985, more than 100,000 people will gather outside the United Nations in New York City to reaffirm their unity with approximately 3 million Soviet Jews who have been striving to freely practice their religion and live in accordance with their own personal, cultural, and traditional values. Unfortunately, in the Soviet Union, Jews are finding it harder and harder to pursue any freedoms in the face of increasingly repressive behavior of the Soviet authorities. Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry is an appropriate and effective way for the western world to bring this issue to the forefront, and demonstrate to the Soviet authorities that their harassment, abuse, and unreasonable persecution of Soviet Jews is unacceptable and cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Soviet Union has gone from bad to worse. Emigration levels are their lowest ever. We recall that 1984 was the most deplorable year since emigration began. Only 896 Jews were permitted to emigrate last year, down from over 51,000 in 1979. It is clear that anti-Semitism has become an inherent part of Soviet policy, with 22 Jewish prisoners of conscience, thousands confined to labor camps and millions forcibly threatened if practicing their faith openly. Through programs like Solidarity Sunday, we can voice our unity and our solidarity with those people who bravely endure systematic harassment because of their faith.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight one of the most recent and blatant examples of the anti-Semitic trend within the Soviet governing body.

In late July 1984, Soviet authorities began a major, sustained crackdown on Hebrew teachers. Since that time four well-known Hebrew teachers have been arrested and convicted on trumped-up charges. Similarly, six prominent Jewish cultural activists have been convicted on equally specious charges.

In addition to this wave of arrests, reports filtering back to the United

States indicate that scores of Hebrew punishment. There are numerous reports of beatings, raids, job loss, interrogations, confiscation of religious articles and literature, and other forms of systematic harassment.

The U.S. State Department has been monitoring these disturbing developments with concern since the crackdown began in July 1984. There can be no doubt that the campaign has been consciously directed by Soviet authorities to discredit and destroy the revival of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. The methods used—arrests, beatings, planting false evidence, and using the media to slander refuseniks—have created a renewed atmosphere of crisis in the Soviet Jewish community and heightened international concern about what may next lie in store for Soviet Jewry.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet campaign against Hebrew teachers like all its other anti-Semitic programs, violates the commitments the U.S.S.R. has made to respect individual human rights. Their actions are not only contrary to the international laws defined in a series of Accords from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights through the Helsinki Final Act, but they also contradict Soviet internal standards as stated in articles 26 and 52 of the Soviet Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on this occasion of the 14th anniversary of Solidarity Sunday, we recount the offensive human rights violations of the Soviet authorities and reaffirm our commitment to do everything possible to let them know that we, as a people, expect more from them. We demand, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviet authorities elevate themselves to a higher standard of conduct and adhere to their own vows to respect the fundamental human rights of Soviet Jews.

Through the mass participation in Solidarity Sunday, let our repressed Jewish family members and friends within the Soviet Union know that their plight and indeed their courage, is not and will not be forgotten.●

## VETERANS' HEALTH CARE BUDGET CANNOT BE REDUCED FURTHER

### HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks, the House and Senate will be making major decisions on the budget for fiscal year 1986. Many Federal programs will be affected. The decisions we must make will not be easy. We all have different priorities.

A very high priority of mine is veterans' health care. I want my colleagues

to fully understand the impact of any budget reductions in funds to operate the VA's health care system. Who is better able to relate the problems in the field than the people in the field?

According to the chiefs of staff at VA hospitals nationwide who responded to a recent survey, inadequate budgets are already taking their toll. More cuts in the budget will mean longer waiting lists, the turning away of certain non-service-connected veterans, and delays in many surgical procedures.

There follows a report from the chief of staff at the VA Medical Center in Salt Lake City, UT:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,

MEDICAL CENTER,

Salt Lake City, UT, December 26, 1984.

HOWARD GREEN, M.D.,

Chief of Staff (11), VA Medical Center, White River Junction, VT.

DEAR HOWARD: I am responding to our conversation last week with this letter which identifies problems that are specific to our own institution but generic to VA Medical Centers throughout the system.

1. We are facing a \$1,000,000 deficit in FY 1985. What have we done to date and what is the impact of the same?

a. We maintain an employment lag of 7% of our authorized staffing (85 out of 1208 authorized FTEE). This results in slower patient care, low morale, lower patient satisfaction, and reduced patient confidence in the quality of care.

b. Reduction of accessibility to 30 high cost drugs has resulted in poorer patient care (e.g., poor control of pain in severe arthritis and use of some less effective, but cheaper antibiotics).

c. We backlog orthopedic surgery, ophthalmology and open heart surgery from 2-4 months. This is detrimental to those individuals with painful hips, knees, and to those who cannot see because of cataracts. Delay of surgery is potentially a lethal factor for those patients requiring open heart surgery.

d. We are restricting the follow-up visits of non service-connected patients to one visit with the exception of cancer, hemodialysis and total joint patients. This has the potential of poor care since complications could develop unnoticed.

e. As of January 1, 1985, we will proceed to control elective surgery in all fields, in spite of the fact that our operating load has increased 23% during the first quarter of FY 85 and had increased 15-18% in FY 84 over FY 83.

f. The acuity of our patients on surgery, medicine, psychiatry and neurology all have markedly increased in the past 18 months which is probably due to:

1. Aging population;

2. Reduction in Medicare/Medicaid payments. This has generated a new group of patients accessing the VA system (10% at minimum);

3. Impact of DRGs on non-federal hospitals has increased the number of patients being moved from non-federal to VA hospitals.

g. The cost of pharmacy, prosthetics, etc. all continue to rise at 15-30% annually.

h. We have initiated selective restriction of home oxygen to non service-connected patients.

i. We have maintained our seven bed Alcohol Detoxification Unit on an Acute Medical

Ward instead of moving it to the Alcohol Rehabilitation Unit which has saved four nurses but has placed an additional load on acute medical nursing.

j. We have replaced two technician positions with outside drug company money. These technicians render some patient care and thereby save the hospital two positions.

k. We have reduced our inhalation therapy staffing, placing part of that responsibility on the nursing staff and we are also selectively ordering respiratory therapy treatments.

The rate of inflation in non-salary areas continues to average between 14-20% annually. Some high cost items such as pharmacy have increased 30% per year during the past three years. This station's recurring, non-salary budget for FY 85 is \$14,470,581. Even a minimal 14% rate of inflation justifies an increased cost allowance of \$2,025,881. We received only \$535,787 for FY 85 target allowance or approximately 26% of what was actually needed to maintain our previous level of services. This underfunding precipitated a large cut in the level of employment which this Medical Center cannot sustain.

2. The delay in open heart surgery can have serious implications in patients who often are unstable or are rapidly becoming unstable. The delays in other surgeries are inconvenient to the patient and cause physical suffering (for patients needing joint replacement) and anguish (for older patients requiring cataract surgery).

The increasing lack of non-professional personnel (we have given precedence to protect persons delivering direct patient care) has created serious and increasing difficulties. To enumerate a few: Delays in pharmacy to fill prescriptions (Pharmacy understaffing); Delays in discharging patients (MAS understaffing); Delays in the support work necessary to maintain the functioning of the institution (2337s, Personnel Actions, reports, manuscript typing); Delays in procurement of supplies (Supply understaffing). These all reduce the effectiveness of the professional staff. Perhaps more important is the effect that is being seen in morale. VA people—nurses, physicians, non-professionals—are all as dedicated a group as exists, but their willingness to devote the extra time and energy over and above their prescribed tours of duty is being over taxed. Having been in several VA's and also closely affiliated with several other hospitals (non-federal), I can assure you of the markedly superior attitude of federal health care employees. I believe this attitude cannot be maintained in the face of the problems listed above.

3. What questions should we ask of COSs in our VA Medical Centers regarding similar problems. The following are some suggestions which I am sure can be expanded.

a. Size of hospital;

b. Affiliated (yes/no);

c. Projected dollar deficit as of January 1, 1985;

(1) Personnel Services;

(2) All Others;

d. Impact of dollar deficit;

(1) Personnel;

(2) Supplies;

(3) Equipment;

(4) Backlog of patient surgery (specific numbers, types and length of delay);

e. Solutions you have devised (please be as specific as possible).

In conclusion I say that "enough is enough." For the past five years we have been funded for increases in product cost at

less than 1/2 the actual increase. Increased benefits to veterans have further added pressure to provide services from inadequate dollars. Additionally, new technology also has impacted our dollars. This adds up to the fact that we are no longer able to render the best of care to all eligible veterans.

Regards,

MARK W. WOLCOTT, M.D.,

Chief of Staff (11).●

## MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

HON. THOMAS R. CARPER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. The contest theme this year was "My Pledge to America."

The winner of the Delaware competition this year was Beth Reister of Ocean View, DE. She is an 11th grade honor student at Indian River School in Frankford, DE.

Beth's essay concludes with a quote from Richard E. Byrd, "Democracy, backed by unity, and sweat, and sacrifice is the most potent idea in the history of mankind." In her essay, Beth recognizes the truth of this idea and pledges to work for our country—our democracy. I believe we all can benefit from her thoughts and actions.

## MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

The Greek philosopher Aristotle once said, "If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost."

These words, though spoken by Aristotle centuries ago, are interesting to note with reference to the more modern history of the British Empire. It was a lack of democracy, a lack of equal representation and sharing in the government, that led to the tension between England and the colonies.

After years of struggling from the powerful grip of England's tyranny, the colonies declared their independence and broke free of British control. The people of this new nation, known as the United States, were forced to establish a new government; a government that was just and fair.

The founders of America worked for many days devising a suitable plan of government. The high point of their meetings was reached with the formation of the Constitution of the United States. This single, great document epitomized America's thirst for freedom and liberty. It outlined the democratic ideals of participation and equality in government.

The new government, as stated in the Constitution, would become a system in which the supreme power would be vested in the people. It would be a system in which the government derived by holding periodic elections of both the President and members of Congress.

In order to preserve the democratic ideas of our forefathers, I pledge service to the American form of government. I will contin-



ue the support of our democracy by participation in local, state, and federal government.

I will vote, and persuade others to do so, for voting by all citizens enables us to ensure the principle of equal representation in our government.

As I've done this election year, I will continue to be politically active. By endorsing candidates, distributing pamphlets, and attending political party functions, I can motivate others to become active in our government and vote. This is perhaps the most important democratic ideal; that every person can participate and that every person has an equal share in government.

As a future leader, whether as a chairperson of a community organization, as a representative in my state legislature, or as a senator in the United States Congress, I will fight to uphold the democratic ideals, freedoms, and civil liberties granted in the Constitution.

In addition to my advocacy of democratic constitutional principles, I pledge to protect and preserve our beautiful country for future generations. After all, one cannot respect the government of the United States if it fails to preserve the environment.

It is of great importance that we keep America's waters and air clean and free from pollution. Toxic and hazardous waste disposal areas should be limited and free from leakage. It is the responsibility of the federal government to see that pollutants are kept to a low minimum and to make sure that the natural resources of this country are not misused.

In order to attain this country's preservation, I will join national and community efforts to stop pollution and stop the exploitation of our land and water.

I will protest illegal dumping by writing to my representative and my senator. I will demand that the Environmental Protection Agency raise its standards and create regulations concerning pollution control. I'll suggest that companies that do not comply with the new regulations be penalized heavily.

It took millions of years for the rivers, lakes, mountains, and wilderness of this country to evolve. Within the last 100 years, however, pollutants have destroyed many of these beautiful areas. This statement seems paradoxical, for a nation whose government endorses equality, freedom, and liberty should be more humane and more caring for the environment.

In conclusion, a quote from Richard E. Byrd, "Democracy, backed by unity, and sweat, and sacrifice, is the most potent idea in the history of mankind".

Because of my love and respect for America, for the country itself, and for its fair government, I am ready to unite, to sweat, and even to sacrifice for the principles of democracy, and the preservation of our resources; in essence, the betterment of the United States as a whole.●

#### GRADY COLUMNS ON EL SALVADOR AND HONDURAS

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 days, I have shared with my colleagues reflections on Nicaragua

written by Sandy Grady, reporter for the Philadelphia Daily News. Sandy was part of the delegation I led to El Salvador and Nicaragua during the April recess.

Sandy's fourth article, reprinted here, describes well the atmosphere of fear which pervades El Salvador. The final article in Sandy's series focuses on Honduras, which Sandy visited after he left my delegation. It also recapitulates Sandy's feelings about the entire trip. These pieces reinforce the point that the view of Central America on the ground is different from the view from the United States. I do encourage my colleagues to visit Central America to find out for themselves. But, in the meantime, I recommend a short tour of Central America through Sandy Grady's eyes. The articles follow:

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Apr. 25, 1985]

#### SALVADOR: ARMED AND IN DANGER

SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR.—You know you're in Parana Country when you're met at the airport by a van with bullet-proof windows and a guy in the front right seat cradling a sawed-off shotgun.

On the 60-mph ride into San Salvador, Senor Shotgun's eyes flicker across the ditches and shrubs.

"Guerrillas hit and burned a truck here last week," he says at one crossroad.

This is a country in which three things dominate: guns, guns and guns. This is the National Rifle Association's dream society. Everybody packs heat, or hires bodyguards to do it. I don't know where El Salvador is headed—but it's going there fully armed.

Put it this way: At the Camino Real hotel, on the sixth floor, where two U.S. congressmen were staying, three young men in T-shirts sat all night on the hallway floor. They had .45s and eyed everyone who got off an elevator.

"We have to protect our guests," said a hotel manager.

Another scene: A family browses through a supermarket. Mama, papa and 13-year-old son are all carrying weapons.

You're in a country the size of New Jersey that has lost 50,000 people in a civil war. I noticed that in San Salvador's only shopping mall, ironically the biggest stores sell kid's toys—and cemetery lots.

Sure, there is a veneer of prosperity here. Joggers in running shoes thump up the streets. There are McDonald's golden arches. But gunships roar overhead. And people nervously eye the four-wheel-drive Cherokee Chiefs with darkened windows, the vehicle of choice for death squads.

The U.S. Embassy line is that things are "working out" in El Salvador. There aren't as many corpses each week. The U.S.-trained army is getting slicker. And Jose Duarte, our man in the President's House, won a surprisingly big mid-April election.

But the mood I detected was of grim resignation toward the war, and a pervasive fear that hangs in the air like gray smog. Nobody trusts nobody—right, left or center. A U.S. newsman finds Salvadorans back away, a furtive look in their eyes, when asked if they can be quoted by name.

"Don't even print the name of my university," says a professor after giving an analysis of the country. "They'll track me down."

"The best jobs here," half-jokes a bearded young San Salvadoran, "are bodyguard and informant."

I wasn't convinced El Salvador's scary Wild West shoot-'em-up was real until the lights went out in the middle of a session with President Duarte—and everyone suspected a guerrilla attack.

This was upstairs at the *Casa Presidencial*, a sort of Central American version of Tara, with flowers in the courtyard and huge paintings of El Salvador's historic moments.

Jose Napoleon Duarte, a stocky 58-year-old in a blue blazer and red tie, was doing a monologue for four U.S. congressmen. Duarte is a political animal with a bullish energy. He was bouncing in his chair, talking in slow rumbling English, chopping the air with his left hand.

You notice the hand because two middle fingers are missing, a symbol of Duarte's resistance against the junta in the early 1970s.

Duarte's gabbing away about the mandate his Christian Democrats won, backed up by the military. For the first time in a 25-year career, Duarte has solid clout. He talks of judicial reform, of land reform, of making peace with the rebels—always sliding away from real promises.

"I'm ready for sincere dialogue," says Duarte imperiously, "but I will not listen to them [the guerrillas] harangue me."

Suddenly the chandeliers go dark. The air conditioner groans to a stop. Swiftly, Duarte aides throw open windows. The president keeps talking in the semi-twilight.

"Damn guerrillas," whispers a Duarte aide. "Probably shot up a transformer."

So now we're sitting in the dark *Casa Presidencial*. And Duarte is on an impassioned roll. The subject that steams him up is guns, of course. He's raving about the two C-47 gunships the United States has provided—versions of "Puff the Magic Dragon" planes used in Vietnam, with special night sights and machine guns that can rattle 1,500 rounds a minute.

When guerrillas attacked TV towers atop a volcanic peak overlooking San Salvador last month, Duarte strolled out to this tennis court to watch the C-47 do its stuff.

We would have lost 90 soldiers in the attack if not for the gunship," says Duarte. "It can fight in the middle of the night, so our troops can take over at daylight. The gunships will destroy the initiative of the rebels."

The congressman listen stonily. They know Duarte is pitching for six more of the C-47 gunships—controversial because they're dangerous to civilians. Duarte already has four rapid-fire Hughes 500 helicopters coming from the United States. He also has a fleet of 39 U.S. transport choppers, plus nine A-37 Dragonfly jets with bomb racks. A nice little air force.

Politicians like Duarte talk of democracy. But in El Salvador, it always comes down to guns.

The next day, I was in a refugee camp named Domus Mareae. This was eight miles from the President's House. But another world—corrugated tins roofs, dirt floors, 560 people packed behind wire fence, plenty of flies, chickens and children.

They talked here also of the C-47s. They were not so enthused as Duarte. Peasant women who had fled the war zone called the plan *Los Despacitos*—The Slow One.

"Every night they drop flares, then the Slow One starts firing," said a woman, 26, with four kids hanging to her. "We were in San Vicente province. The mortars, the big

plane, the army sweeps—if we don't get away, we'll be killed. We walked here in eight days."

A dozen women sat in the stifling hut and told similar stories. A blind father killed in aerial bombardment. A daughter imprisoned as a rebel. A husband blindfolded and pushed screaming off a cliff by soldiers. The refugees seemed more terrified by the army and its planes than by the FMLN (Farabundo Martí Liberation Front).

"We're seeing a lot of trauma and civilian deaths from aerial machine-gun fire," said a U.S.-born woman psychiatrist, who wanted to be anonymous. "People working with the peasants see the C-47s as instruments of terror."

Nonsense, says Thomas Pickering, the U.S. ambassador here before his transfer to Israel. The rangy, fast-talking Pickering was in the basement of the U.S. Embassy—probably the most expensive bunker in Central America, surrounded by soldiers behind sandbags, metal windows, concertina wire and a rocket screen.

"I'm guardedly optimistic," said Pickering. "Duarte tells me the guerrillas are demoralized. The El Salvador military is much better now. It can fight at night in small, mobile units. I think we can make 80 percent of the country secure. The horrors of 1980 to '82, the disappearances and killings of civilians by both sides, are over. I think we're turning the corner."

But other diplomats, encountered at a poolside party at Pickering's home, were far less cheerful.

"The U.S. will have to prop up this country for a long time," said embassy official David Passage. "Those 10,000 boys in the hills [the guerrillas] aren't going away quickly."

El Salvador has a high level of weirdness. Duarte seems isolated, alone in his palace. The cities are full of noise, glittery junk and poverty. Tough-looking mugs with Uzi machine guns were everywhere. The tabloid *El Prensario* headlines, SUBVERSIVOS MASSACRAN 20 CIVILES.

Ho-hum, 20 more deaths. It was like a baseball score.

In El Salvador, it always comes down to guns.

#### HONDURAS: THE U.S. ARSENAL

TEGUCIGALPA, HONDURAS.—"Welcome to the USS Honduras," says a U.S. Special Forces captain drinking beer in the dark Holiday Inn cocktail lounge.

That's the standing joke about this hot, sparsely populated country—that it's the only U.S. aircraft carrier propelled by bananas.

Such Yankee humor makes sensitive Hondurans bristle.

But the U.S. jets roaring over narrow streets, the out-of-uniform Green Berets playing roulette in the local casino, the U.S. air fields and contra camps a few hours away, the M-60 tanks on maneuver—they stamp Honduras as the U.S. arsenal for any future Central American war.

If House Speaker Tip O'Neill was right when he grumbled to President Reagan, "You're not going to be satisfied until you go into Nicaragua," this will be the launch pad.

I doubt if even the Sandinista leaders who prattle constantly about a U.S. invasion think it's a likely event. They're sophisticated enough to know that Reagan would need a dramatic excuse, such as a Soviet military base. And they're careful students of U.S. opinion polls.

"An invasion with U.S. troops would be a double tragedy," said U.S. Ambassador Harry Bergold over drinks at his Managua home. "It would devastate Nicaragua. And public opinion in the U.S. would go sky-high against it."

But if tempers suddenly flared—they did in Washington last year amid rumors of Soviet MIGs in Nicaragua—the U.S. military buildup in Honduras would be a powerful right hook waiting to be thrown.

"If somebody dials 911 [a police call] that is where the phone will ring," said a Green Beret Officer.

You only have to spend a couple of days here to sense that Honduras is a nervous host to what amounts to a massive Yankee SWAT team.

Sixty miles north in a deserted valley is Palmerola air base, where U.S. pilots take off each night in OV-1 Mohawks. They run surveillance flights over El Salvador, checking guerrilla movements with infrared scopes.

Eight miles south on a dusty plain, M-60 tanks and M113 personnel carriers rumble. Off the Atlantic Coast, Marines and paratroopers have been practicing an amphibious landing. All together, there have been about 10,000 U.S. troops maneuvering in jungle warfare here in April.

That doesn't count the 1,000 U.S. Special Forces, military advisers, CIA agents and air personnel operating here. Or the eight U.S. airstrips, four base camps and two radar sites.

"We're well aware of the message Reagan is sending us," Sandinista commandante Dora Tellez said.

If Honduran politicians and generals get jittery, they're assured this hardware is for their protection. As Gen. Paul Gorman, then head of the U.S. Southern command, told them last year: "You can stick with us or go with the Cubans."

Even the stunning defeat given Reagan in the U.S. House on \$14-million military aid for the contras operating out of Honduras base camps will probably have no quick effect. By all reports, the 15,000 anti-Sandinista rebels plan to keep operating on private U.S. money.

"We take the president at this word when he says he won't walk away from the contras and they'll somehow be funded," said a man in the U.S. Embassy here.

I stopped in Honduras after a weeklong tour through El Salvador and Nicaragua, talking to a spectrum of people in those war-torn countries with a group that included Rep. Bob Edgar, D-Pa., and Rep. Ted Weiss, D-N.Y.

You don't come away from such a trip singing "Yankee Doodle Dandy"—or rosily confident that a U.S. policy built on gunships and military pressure will ever work in Central America.

It looks different from here. The Washington stereotype—that this is a Soviet vs. U.S. superpower showdown, that keeping the Russkies out of the region is the only goal—breaks down when you see the region's poverty.

Gunships, troops and anti-Red rhetoric won't change that. You wonder if anyone in the Reagan administration has a feel for the history, the hungers of the *campesinos* in the tin-roofed shacks. The Kissinger Commission's suggestion of putting \$8 billion over five years into Central America has been flatly ignored.

So what happens next? More of the same, more guns, more poverty?

Curiously, I came away mildly optimistic about Nicaragua. Yes, Daniel Ortega & Co.

walk and talk like homemade Marxists. Yes, they're fast consolidating everything under the red-and-black Sandinista flag. Yes, there's tons of Soviet military stuff around. Yes, their economy's going to hell.

"I'm shocked how fast the country's gone downhill in six months," Dr. John Chilton, a U.S. sugar expert who's made 44 trips into Nicaragua over 20 years, told me. "Poor crops, people being killed in the war, farm trucks out of parts. They're headed for a blowup in two years."

Maybe. But there was a mood of hope in Nicaragua you didn't feel elsewhere. Whatever they are—Marxists, Christians, nationalists, who knows?—the Sandinistas are indisputably doing something for the people's health, literacy and pride.

The question is whether the Reagan honchos will be shrewd enough to use diplomacy, pressure and U.S. aid to keep Nicaragua nonaligned. Beats war. And it's not too late.

El Salvador, where the embassy line is that democracy is working, that the U.S. is "back in control," left me queasily pessimistic.

Yes, thanks to C-47 gunships, Huey choppers and U.S. trainers, the El Salvadoran army is quicker and meaner. But civilians are still dying. The guerrillas are more vicious. President Jose Duarte is still the army's figurehead. Army brutality goes unpunished. The country's population is exploding. El Salvador felt like an armed state. Many guns, much fear.

The most impressive man I met in San Salvador was a young professor who keeps records on his country, which he obviously loves. He spent an hour brilliantly analyzing El Salvador's politics and economy. Because of possible retribution, he wouldn't let me use his name, even his university's name.

The last question was: "Where's this country going to be in 10 years?"

Long silence. Then he spoke slowly.

"The war will be going on, with neither side winning. The economy will still be going down. And we will still be dependent on the United States, probably for all my life."

When he stopped, he was near tears.

In Washington, the men behind the Central America desks talk of more gunships, of free-fire zones, of winning hearts and minds, of the Red menace. Sounds familiar.

It looks different from here. ●

#### HAWAII VFW WINNING ESSAY

##### HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest each year. This year more than 300,000 secondary school students throughout the Nation participated in the contest. The contest theme was "My Pledge To America." I am pleased to submit Hawaii's winning essay written by Craig Okamura.

My Pledge to America cannot be described by one idea alone, because it is more than one thing that I contribute to my country.



Like any other citizen of a country, I am loyal to it and I shall help to defend it in time of war. I'm proud to be a citizen of the United States and show this by celebrating Independence Day (July 4), the day America became independent and free.

I also go to school to acquire knowledge of various subjects so that later on in life I can get a job to support myself and my family. Obtaining a good education may also help me apply what I've learned in school, to my career choice. I wish to pursue a career in engineering. This way, I can help design machinery which may benefit the people of the United States in some way. I could invent some kind of new transportation which won't use up the natural resources we have, or maybe invent some new type of air conditioner which could give you the climate that you want from anywhere in the world.

When I become 18 years old, I will vote for the people who I feel should be in office running our country. This way, I know my voice is being heard when I vote for the people who I think should be the leaders of my country. In the United States, my vote counts!

I support my country whenever I pay the tax on the goods and services that I purchase. I really don't mind paying these taxes because I know these taxes are used to help provide essential services for the people. At least these taxes aren't as bad as the ones the British placed upon the Americans in the 1700's.

I also place my faith in America when things are bad, like the time when Americans were held hostage in Iran. I kept on hoping that they would be released and safely returned home, and they were after their long stay in the Iranian prisons.

I'm patriotic to my country, too. I have an American Flag which I display in my room on the Fourth of July and I stand when our country's National Anthem is being played. I know what these symbols represent. When I watch the Olympics, no matter how terrific the other countries may be, I always feel a sense of pride when our athletes perform.

There is one last thing that I contribute to my country. And this is probably the greatest thing that I have to give to America. That's my love. I love this great country for all the opportunities and protection that it has to offer me. In this land, anyone's "American Dream" can be achieved if you try hard enough to get it, no matter what color, race, or sex you may happen to be. It is a land of freedom, where whatever I wish to do or become is my choice, and I may pursue it. It is a land where I receive a fair trial when accused of a crime of any nature. It is a land where my basic human rights are protected by the first ten amendments to the Constitution.

Our democratic society is preferable to all other forms of governments. It requires the participation of all its citizens. Therefore, my pledge to America is to do my part in keeping her strong, prosperous, and free! ●

#### COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A TRAINING GROUND FOR THE NEW TECHNOLOGY

**HON. DOUG WALGREN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, the high technology revolution in the

workplace can mean new jobs; It can also mean lost jobs. Technology can offer great promise; it can also bring great pain. We must try to make sure we have the training resources workers need to adapt to the new technologies.

On May 2, I introduced H.R. 2353, the National Advanced Technician Training Act [NATTAT], to establish a program in community and technical colleges for training young people and adults in advanced technology fields. This bill can draw on the unique resources of the Nation's community college network—the largest, most flexible arm of higher education with strong ties to local employers.

#### THE WORKPLACE OF THE FUTURE

Employment in high technology areas is expected to increase more than 100 percent by 1990—more than four times the employment growth rate in all other kinds of occupations. Some have said that today's technological transition is comparable to the industrial revolution. Pat Choate, in "Retooling the American Work Force," has observed:

The speed and force of . . . change will be awesome . . . . Consequently, millions of jobs and workers will become obsolete . . . . In this decade virtually all of the nation's workers will need to be retrained or have their skills sharpened.

Some projections: Data processing jobs will grow by 148 percent, programming jobs will jump by 74 percent; computer analysts will increase by 108 percent. By 1990, almost half of American workers will use technical equipment daily.

What does all this mean? In some cases, it means new jobs. In some cases, it means "old" jobs eliminated. In some cases, it means jobs take a new form. In almost all cases, it means that workers will have to learn new skills and knowledge. Most of these workers are now in the work force.

The National Advanced Technician Training Act attempts to adjust to this job revolution by creating a matching grant program in the National Science Foundation to help community colleges develop model programs to train and retrain workers of all ages; \$20 million would be authorized for the first year; each grant would be matched by non-Federal funds, such as local government or private industry. In my own home area, Allegheny County government has contributed \$1 million to our local community college to a program for displaced workers. Funds would be used to develop programs and courses, train faculty, organize cooperative training programs with local industry, and purchase necessary equipment.

The bill would direct NSF to consider several important criteria in awarding grants: people in need of retraining or upgrading to retain their jobs; workers dislocated by plant closings

and technological change; working people and parents who need flexible scheduling; young people just out of high school; high school dropouts; and handicapped people with special needs.

#### WHY COMMUNITY COLLEGES?

Community colleges are the ideal places for retraining. They can offer low-cost programs with flexible scheduling. This is particularly important to adults with jobs and families—almost 50 percent of present community college students are noncollege age. Community colleges can design programs with local industry—often on-the-job training—specifically designed to meet local industry's needs. They can attract faculty from industry, people to teach part time in a field related to their work.

The community college is an especially good training ground for displaced workers, people whose jobs are eliminated because of a plant shutdown, retooling with new equipment, or changes in the economy. From 1979 to 1984, 5.1 million jobs were lost in the United States. By 1984, 25 percent of those unemployed were still looking for jobs. In areas like mine, we are still wading through the aftermath of the recession. Steel industry employment has been cut in half. Studies of automation in the workplace tell us that technological innovations in manufacturing industries will exacerbate unemployment in the Northeast, where manufacturing industries like metalworking are concentrated.

#### STAYING COMPETITIVE

We are awash with studies and headlines decrying the decline of our industries and products in the international marketplace and the fact that many of our products are not competitive with those from Japan or other Third World producers. We are told that Japan's steel mills produce an average of 700 to 1,000 tons per year per employee, twice the rate of American steelworkers in traditional American plants. The hope of many of our industries is modernization, technological and process innovations to put our products back in competition with those from other countries. This country's trade deficit has reached unprecedented levels, almost \$130 billion this year. Without a skilled technical work force, we will never catch up. This bill could be a good start.

The Red Queen in "Alice in Wonderland," gives us guidance: ". . . it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that." We had better get moving.

I hope my colleagues will lend their support to this bill to make a major effort in technician training through community colleges and trade schools. ●

May 9, 1985

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS WEEK,  
1985

**HON. MAJOR R. OWENS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we note the contributions of small businesses to our society and to our economy. In 1983, small businesses employed one-half of the private sector work force and created two out of three new jobs. In the same year, 38 percent of the gross national product was generated by small businesses.

In addition to the economic impact, small businesses generate at least half of all major innovations. This creativity contributes much to our society. It also helps in keeping America competitive in a fast-paced technologic world.

Small businesses, which give so much to the society, need our support. The creation of the Small Business Administration in 1953 provided the means by which small businesses could begin and be supported through loans—direct, participant, and guaranteed—development aid, aid to small and minority business investment companies, management counseling, assistance in obtaining Government contracts, revolving lines of credit and surety bond guarantees. Unfortunately, the work of the Small Business Administration has been curtailed as a result of the spending cuts for domestic programs included in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981. The act reduced the direct lending and the guaranteed loan program. Direct loans which were made, were made at higher interest rates.

Small businesses will continue to need our support. That support has resulted in jobs and in the development of products which are essential in trying to keep up with other nations in the world marketplace. If the deficit continues to eat up capital, they will need our support in order to compete with large established businesses for capital. This is particularly true for newly established businesses. It would be poor public policy if we were to shut out new businesses now. We have just begun to see more significant participation by minority and women's businesses in our economy. This trend has provided opportunities and jobs in many of our communities which have been hardest hit by unemployment.

I appreciate this opportunity to commend the entrepreneurs who have risked so much and worked so hard to start their own businesses. They deserve our support.●

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WE'RE RUNNING OUT OF OIL  
FASTER THAN PREDICTED;  
THIS IS NO TIME TO LOWER  
AUTO EFFICIENCY STANDARDS

**HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows there is a finite amount of liquid petroleum. Or to put it more bluntly: We're running out of gas.

This morning's news is that we're running out of gas faster than we thought.

The Department of Interior now estimates that there is 55 percent less oil and 44 percent less gas in our offshore waters than was estimated just 4 years ago. The estimates of resources off the Alaskan coast were cut by a crushing 70-plus percent.

The Office of Technology Assessment reported yesterday that "oil imports, which have declined in recent years, are expected to gradually increase and may again reach the high levels of the 1970's" which "would make the country more vulnerable to supply interruptions and would increase the trade deficit."

I mention all of this as more evidence why the administration should reject requests by Ford and GM to lower the fuel mileage efficiency standards on new car fleets from 27.5 mpg to 26 mpg. Those two companies—despite nearly a decade of warning—have been unable to reach the 1985 standard of 27.5 mpg. Chrysler has made the standard. So, rather than pay a fine of hundreds of millions, they want the standard lowered.

Lowering the standard will be a rip-off of consumers—but it will be a future disaster for the Nation. It will increase our future oil consumption by millions of barrels per year—hastening the day when we reach another oil crisis, soaring prices and gasoline lines for everyone.

I urge Members to cosponsor my bill setting a 27.5 mpg minimum standard and removing the administration's authority to lower the standard.

Let's think about the morning energy news and say no to weakening energy efficiency standards.●

FED GOVERNOR WORRIED  
ABOUT THE EFFECT ON POOR  
OF RECENT BANK MOVES

**HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, in today's dynamic and deregulated financial marketplace, many low-income working Americans, senior citizens,

11617

and young people can lose access to basic banking services through a regressive fee structure imposed by banks and other depository institutions.

Recently, I introduced the Financial Services Access Act—H.R. 2011—to direct banks and other federally insured depository institutions to offer new accounts to meet the basic banking needs of lower income consumers.

On May 7, the American Banker publication printed an article entitled: "Fed Governor Worried About Effect on Poor of Recent Bank Moves." I commend to my colleagues' attention the thoughtful words of warning by Emmett J. Rice, Federal Reserve Board Governor, and ask that the article be printed in its entirety.

FED GOVERNOR WORRIED ABOUT EFFECT ON  
POOR OF RECENT BANK MOVES

(By David Ahearn)

WASHINGTON.—It is time for close scrutiny of "the possible adverse effects on low- and moderate-income individuals of some of the changes taking place in our financial system," Emmett J. Rice, a Federal Reserve Board governor, said last week.

Such individuals, including young and old Americans, have been harmed by bank branch closings, moves by banking institutions to serve "upscale" instead of low-balance customers, higher fees and reduced services at many banks, and other banking developments, Mr. Rice told a Banking Law Institute conference.

Fed studies show that bank fees rose two to four times as fast as the cost of living from 1980 to 1983, he said, and "there is some evidence that certain groups may not be using the banking system as much as they once did."

"The number of younger people with checking accounts went down significantly from 73% to 63% between 1977 and 1983—perhaps at least partially because of these increased fees," he said.

The studies also show that the lowest-income individuals surveyed dropped from 56% having checking accounts to 44%. Young families with neither a checking nor savings account doubled, from 11% to 22% of those surveyed. Those who have no account may never be able to obtain credit, he said.

While some technological advances may provide new services to replace lost traditional services—such as banking through home computers replacing the loss of bank branches—Mr. Rice questioned whether low- and moderate-income individuals will be able to take advantage of such innovations. Many might not be able to afford home computers, or might not be sufficiently literate to use them, he said.

He also criticized other recent innovations in the banking industry.

"We must continue to give careful attention to issues such as the propriety of banks and others using loopholes in our banking laws and the efforts of the agencies or the Congress to close these loopholes, as well as the wisdom of granting new powers and allowing full interstate banking," he said.●



# SAM J. ERVIN, JR.—A GIANT HAS FALLEN

## HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Monday, May 6, 1985*

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, in further tribute to Senator Sam J. Ervin, I would like to submit the statements of two former colleagues of mine, Mr. Basil L. Whitener and Mr. Hugh Q. Alexander.

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.—A GIANT HAS FALLEN  
(By Basil L. Whitener, Former Member of Congress)

Sam J. Ervin, Jr., an unrelenting champion of the great constitutional principles on which our democracy is forged, has gone to his Eternal Home. Those of us who have been privileged to know and serve with him are particularly saddened by his passing and are mindful of the void which his death has created among us.

Throughout his very fine and distinguished service in the military during World War I (for which he received the Silver Star and numerous other honors), and as a lawyer, legislator, superior court judge, Member of Congress, justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, and United States Senator, Ervin displayed the attributes of character, ability, integrity, and devotion to State and Nation which mark a great patriot.

As a private citizen, Ervin was a truly devoted son to his distinguished parents and a fiercely loyal husband and father to his wife and children. His characteristic modesty and humor have also contributed to the legend of the man, and that legend will assuredly continue to grow in the generations to come.

I would like to express my sentiments of highest esteem for Senator Ervin and the legacy which we, as North Carolinians and Americans, have received from him—the duty and honor of preserving the Constitution and our American way of government, to which he devoted his life.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Margaret Ervin and to the Senator's children and grandchildren in the very great loss which they feel so keenly and which is certainly shared by our State and Nation.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR.  
(By Hugh Q. Alexander)

It was a great honor for me to serve in the Congress of the United States with Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. The opportunity to learn from a man of such great wisdom and intellect was a special privilege for which I shall always be grateful. His famous stories and humorous illustrations brought forth not only laughter but also a lesson to ponder.

Senator Ervin was a hero to millions of Americans because he exemplified those qualities which characterize the ideals of democracy. Throughout his long, distinguished career, he demonstrated the highest degree of honor, integrity, and the golden rule.

In both his public and personal life, Senator Ervin lived by a creed which placed duty and service before self. His devotion to God and country, his love of family, his sense of time and place, and his warm, caring personality all combined to set this great and good man apart as an example for all mankind.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

One of life's richest experiences for my wife, Myrtle, and me has been the personal friendship of "Senator Sam" and his lovely and gracious wife, "Miss Margaret". In 1973, our son, Stephen, was critically injured in a highway accident while on his way from Alexandria, Virginia, to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Stephen was in the Fairfax Hospital for many months, and the medical bills were enormous. One day, Senator Ervin stopped by my office on Capitol Hill and said that he had come to inquire about Stephen and my wife, who was spending most of her time at the hospital. "Hugh", he continued, "I am not a wealthy man, but I want you to know this: if you have any financial difficulty because of this unfortunate tragedy, please let me know. If I don't have enough money, I'll see that you get it."

This was Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., a man who "walked with kings but never lost the common touch"—a truly great American hero.●

## ANTI-SANDINISTA PRESS CONDEMNS U.S. EMBARGO

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Thursday, May 9, 1985*

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, after failing to win the support of Congress for its covert war against Nicaragua, the Reagan administration has moved unilaterally to punish the Sandinista regime.

In imposing trade sanctions against Nicaragua, President Reagan is once again demonstrating his lack of a policy. A policy requires thinking through the likely consequences of one's actions. President Reagan's embargo is going to hurt the private sector in Nicaragua, one of the very groups U.S. policymakers say we should be supporting.

Private sector leaders in Managua oppose the embargo, and feel caught in the middle of President Reagan's economic war on Nicaragua.

Most of Nicaragua's principal exports are agricultural products. Of the principal crops, private producers account for the bulk of production. According to private sector leaders, 70-80 percent of the cotton is produced privately, 80 percent of the coffee, 70 percent of the cattle, and 50 percent of the sugar.

According to the private sector, 60 percent of manufacturing production is still in private hands.

President Reagan's embargo against Nicaragua strikes its biggest blow against private producers, who are dumbfounded as to why our country has done this to them.

I call your attention to the following critical editorial from La Prensa, Nicaragua's opposition paper which is stridently anti-Sandinista:

[FROM LA PRENSA, MAY 2, 1985]

The breaking of the nonalignment commitment, the surrender of Nicaraguan's

*May 9, 1985*

international policy to the interests and expedencies of the Russian-Cuban-Communist bloc, and to top it off President Ortega's trip to Russia after the Congressional blow to Reagan, have placed us, as we had foreseen editorially, in an extremely serious situation of an economic war for which there would have been no motive if we had an honorable but prudent, revolutionary but democratic government.

We denounce the position of the Sandinista government as "irresponsible and imprudent," as the vice-chairman of the Social Christian Party termed it. But we feel that President Reagan's response is an unjust response, because an economic embargo has equally harmful effects on all the people. The defense of democracy can not be carried out with indiscriminate measures that would bring discredit to the very cause that they seek/claim/to defend.

The great majority of Nicaraguans in the interior of the Republic resist the diverting of the revolution and the totalitarian inclination of the government: but that majority would be the one punished by the embargo.<sup>1</sup> And the risk would be run of repeating the result of the economic embargo in recent world history: the sacrifice of the sacrificed and the consolidation of the sacrificers.●

## POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

### HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, May 8, 1985*

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the celebration of Polish Constitution Day. On May 3, 1791, Poland declared herself a free and sovereign state. However, this declaration arrived too late, as it could not prevent the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. Even though the May 3d Constitution never achieved its designed intentions, it is still considered one of the great events in Polish history. Poland experienced other invasions and partitions which prevented the development of her democratic ideals. These many setbacks did not destroy the spirit of the people of Poland. Poles everywhere dream of a united and free Poland which will reflect the philosophies and ideals of her citizens.

Poles have experienced the joys of democracy and the perils of Soviet rule; and by celebrating Polish Constitution Day, a clear message is sent by Polish people of their commitment and desire for basic human rights. As a nation, Poland has long been remembered for her progressive ideas relating to political freedom and religious toleration, and this celebration is an expression of a nation of people and their will to achieve freedom, justice, equality and individual liberty.

<sup>1</sup>The Spanish text uses the word "bloqueo," which means "blockade." The word for "embargo" would be embargo or prohibición. "Bloqueo económico," however is translated as "embargo."

We all know Poland remains under Soviet control and its people are inflicted with a continued suppression of basic human rights. All democracies look to the vigorous spirit and dedication of the Polish people for strength as we uphold our ideals which coincide with the hopes of Poles everywhere. Even Soviet suppression does not darken the hopes of the Polish people in looking forward to the day a truly independent Polish nation can enjoy the individual liberties which have long been associated with her democratic ideals.

It is with great pleasure that I extend my best wishes to the people of Poland, to Polish-Americans and to those everywhere of Polish descent, as Polish Constitution Day is celebrated. ●

SENATOR SAM ERVIN

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1985

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, Sam Ervin once said that when he retired from Congress, he told his colleagues, "I've been with you 20 years, and I have given you trillions and trillions of dollars' worth of good, sound advice and you've taken about 15 cents' worth of it. So I'm going home."

That was in 1974 when Senator Ervin retired from the Senate. He was going home then to Morganton, NC. Now, that great American has truly gone home, and this Congress and this country will miss him.

We miss that good, sound advice he talked about. We miss his leadership in legislation, and in efforts to keep our Government from getting too big. But perhaps more than anything else, we will miss him for two of his most distinguishing qualities.

The first of these was his uncompromising honesty and determination to stand up for the principles he believed in.

The second was his uncompromising devotion to the Constitution of the United States, and to the freedom it conferred on all of us.

Senator Ervin was a man who was not afraid to face hard jobs or assignments that carried a lot of political risk. He served on the Committee that investigated the late Senator McCarthy, and he wound up his career heading the Watergate investigation. But I find it typical of the man to read this in a UPI account of Senator Ervin's life:

He accepted the Watergate assignment because "it was my duty." Although he fast became a folk hero when his quick wit, dancing eyebrows and fondness for telling a tale were televised during the Watergate hearings, he never sought the limelight. He preferred to research issues himself, and

often attended Senate debates armed with stacks of lawbooks. Watergate focused the Nation's eye on North Carolina's Senator, but Ervin himself is perhaps proudest of his role in drafting legislation allowing Congress to write its own Federal budget.

On this issue we worked together, and I am proud.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Ervin's great devotion to our country and its Constitution was founded on a love of freedom. That is a legacy he leaves to all of us. He was a great American, and he will be remembered with fondness and gratitude by the Congress in which he served, and by history. ●

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS WEEK,  
1985

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President for proclaiming May 5 to 11, 1985, as Small Business Week. The theme for this week is "America at Work." We are a nation of 14 million strong small businesses at work. Small business makes up 99 percent of the total number of businesses in the United States, creates the majority of new jobs in our economy and employs over half of the American work force. Small businesses are more likely than large firms to hire women, youths, older and part-time workers, and people who are out of work. In addition to leading in job creation, small firms furnish two out of three workers with their first jobs.

Small businesses create more than new jobs, they create new opportunities, industries, and innovations. They are involved in high technology, construction, transportation, communications, wholesale and retail trade, services, and much more. All these are important to our economic growth. Small businesses have contributed to the growth of the U.S. economy. With each entrepreneur's perseverance and creativity more opportunities are available than ever before. We should continue to encourage and support our Nation's small business owners. We all benefit from their contributions.

This week, as we celebrate U.S. Small Business Week, I hope everyone will recognize the importance of small business to our economy. I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting our Nation's small businesses. They are, indeed, America at work. ●

## FREE POSTAGE ELECTION PARTICIPATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that I have added my name to the list of cosponsors of H.R. 2216, the Free Postage Election Participation Act, as introduced by my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable MORRIS K. UDALL.

I fully recognize and appreciate the apparent futility of sponsoring legislation to create a program which entails new costs in a year when we are trying so desperately to save money. But I feel so strongly about this subject that I believe the effort must be made, even if it only turns out to be a symbolic effort.

Voting and registering to vote are the very core of our system of government. The acts of registering and voting set in motion the wheels which make our democratic system run. Yet, participation in elections remains alarmingly low. Only 68.3 percent of the eligible U.S. population was registered to vote in the 1984 general election.

I am convinced that a central part of the problem is the role played—or not played—by the Federal Government. Federal law requires State and local governments to provide ballots and registration materials for Federal elections, but does not provide any financial assistance for carrying out this extremely expensive task. In 1984, State and local governments spent \$350 million administering the Presidential election.

H.R. 2216 would ease this burden in a small but hopefully significant way. In effect, the postage for absentee ballots and registration materials mailed by State and local governments would be paid by the Federal Government. State and local officials who have endorsed H.R. 2216 agree that the easing of their financial burden, and a more active Federal role, could well result in increased participation in future elections.

Implementation of the bill's provisions would cost the Treasury about \$4.6 million during a Presidential election year, and \$3.5 million in an "off-year"—a worthwhile and cost-effective expenditure, in my opinion. I realize, however, that I cannot be optimistic that Congress will approve this new expenditure while faced concurrently with proposed cuts in (or total elimination of) programs which already exist, such as social security benefits, education funding, revenue sharing, community block development grants, and currently-authorized postal rate



subsidies—including free postage for the blind and handicapped.

Nonetheless, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2216. It is legislation which is much needed—and, hopefully, whose time inevitably will come.●

NEVADA LULAC HONORS  
HISPANIC EDUCATORS

HON. HARRY REID

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, it was George Santayana who once said, "The great difficulty in education is to get experience out of ideas." With this focus on putting education to work, the challenge for today's teachers is probably the greatest it's been in our Nation's history.

Along with many of the necessary educational transitions that have taken place during the past several years is an awareness that our Nation must adjust to the needs of our population. We recognize that the cultures, languages and uniqueness of many nations must be preserved and integrated into our own Nation's learning foundation.

In order to do this most successfully, we need to look to leaders who are an integral part of these cultures—people who can transmit this firsthand knowledge to our children.

That is why it is such a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished members of Nevada's LULAC, our State and Nation's largest Hispanic advocacy organization, as they honor nine exceptional Nevada educators with the 1984-85 Nevada Hispanic Educator Recognition Awards.

Under the direction of Robert Rivas, Nevada LULAC selected these nine outstanding educators for their contributions to the quality of education in Nevada's public instructional system. Rating criteria in the selection process involved the following categories: Role model, leadership, community involvement, commitments to students, prior awards and recognition, and academic achievements.

In this, the first year for Nevada Hispanic Educator Recognition Awards, LULAC has made a special dedication to Alfred P. Baca, who was a tenured professor with the University of Nevada system until his untimely death in July 1984. I also want to pay tribute to this fine educator, who was more than a unique Hispanic teacher. He was a friend, a leader and role model for the children of Henderson and the entire State. I am pleased to recognize that his influence will continue to impact on the children and adults of Nevada for years to come.

Just as proud as Alfred Baca would be now, I am pleased to have this op-

portunity to introduce you to this year's outstanding Hispanic educators.

Edward Arciniega has been named Hispanic Educator of the Year for 1985, as well as Hispanic Male Educator With the Most Years of Service. He is a Spanish teacher with 34 years of teaching experience. The Churchill County High School educator also contributes his talents to extra-curricular coaching duties in basketball, baseball and football. Through his dedication, he has contributed significantly to the development of the Spanish language in the area, as well as stressing the cultural contributions Hispanics have made to this country and the world. Though eligible for retirement, he has declined to leave teaching because of his commitment to teaching and his love for the students.

Dr. Agustin A. Orci, associate superintendent of Administrative and Special Student Services of the Clark County School District, is the Hispanic Administrator of the Year. A professional educator for 19 years, Dr. Orci is the highest ranking Hispanic within all of Nevada's schools districts. In addition to administrative duties and classroom teaching experience, Dr. Orci has worked on such programs as: The Interlanguage Core Program; curriculum development for special education and the vocationally handicapped; instructional management systems; minimum competency testing legislation; and other diversified programs and projects for the State of Nevada.

Dr. Stella L. Romero Helvie is the 1985 Hispanic Female Administrator of the Year. As the principal of Robert E. Lake Elementary School in Las Vegas, Dr. Helvie exhibits exemplary managerial skills and possesses a very high level of knowledge in the area of instructional supervision, courage and directness. The 12-year veteran of classroom instruction works with her teachers and students to reach peak performances in the education experience. Her diverse background, which includes, but is not limited to, teaching and administration in basic education, special education, home-school education and higher education, makes her an excellent role model for both students and teachers.

Ray Espinoza, a business teacher at Pershing County High School in Lovelock, has been named the Hispanic Secondary Educator of the Year. His 17 years of instruction at the county high school level have been instrumental in preparing business foundations for thousands of students. He is responsible for providing progressive education for tomorrow's business leaders by introducing a successful computer education into the school's curricula. In addition to teaching, he has also served as president of the Classroom Teachers' Association and

as a member of the Meet and Confer Committee.

The Hispanic Junior High School Educator of 1985 is Elsie Jimenez. The Humboldt County junior high school teacher has spent 7 of her 18 years in teaching as a special education teacher at Winnemucca Junior High School. Recognized by her peers as an outstanding teacher, Ms. Jimenez's primary concern is to prepare her students for high school thoroughly enough to enable them to complete 4 years and graduate. She works with her students on every aspect of their school lives and encourages them to participate in extracurricular activities and enter school contests. She considers each student to be a special and unique person and develops her programs individually to their needs. Outside the classroom, Ms. Jimenez assists families with obtaining legal help, handling medical problems and dealing with citizenship matters. She also serves as an interpreter whenever needed.

A fourth-grade teacher from Las Vegas's Pat Diskin Elementary School is the Hispanic Elementary Educator of 1985. Alma Garcia Vining has the personality, ambition and instructional ability that make her an outstanding professional. She works effectively and efficiently with students and parents and is an excellent role model for all her students, especially minority students. Her attitude demonstrates to her students that all people can be successful in this country. To help her perpetuate this sense of self-awareness, Ms. Vining brings forth her teaching experiences, especially those where she taught English to non-English speaking adults.

Henry Jojola is 1985's Hispanic Vocational Educator of the Year. The department coordinator at the Southern Nevada Vocational-Technical Center in Las Vegas has expertise that goes far beyond his 7 years of teaching. His own educational and professional experiences include graduations from nearly 1 dozen electronics programs and schools. He has translated this knowledge into an instructional format that helps him and his students maintain and expand their vocational standards and reach their vocational goals.

Rita Aragon is the 1985 Hispanic Female Educator With the Most Years of Service. She is a second-grade teacher at Rose Warren Elementary School in Clark County. The 27-year teaching veteran has spent most of her teaching career with predominantly Mexican-American students in inner-city schools in Los Angeles. However, for the last 9 years, she has taught in southern Nevada. Ms. Aragon has a great love for teaching and working with children. She takes pride in seeing them learn and grow to

become good and valuable citizens. She always stresses and demonstrates the importance of self-esteem in helping a child develop fully.

The Most Promising Hispanic Educator of 1985 is Miriam Smyth, a foreign language teacher at Valley High School in Las Vegas. Recognized for her enthusiasm and innovative teaching techniques, Ms. Smyth adds energy to everything she does in foreign language instruction. During her 6 years of teaching, she has continued to use exciting and creative methods to challenge her students. She is the type of role model that LULAC encourages other Hispanic students to follow in pursuing a teaching career.

Again, I am pleased to congratulate LULAC for this recognition program and these nine Hispanic educators for their outstanding contributions.

As a Congressman from a southwestern State, I am especially aware of the positive influence Hispanics can have toward the development of this region and the Nation. Understandably, there is no place that this impact is and will continue to be felt more strongly than in our school systems. After all, it is during our formative years that we lay the foundations for our futures.

Through the influence of these outstanding educators we can find new and renewed reasons to be proud \* \* \* to reinforce our belief in education as one of the institutions we most cherish in this great Nation.

To these outstanding Hispanic educators I say thank you for jobs well done and service abundantly rendered. Indeed, the House of Representatives salutes you.●

#### THE RICHNESS OF THE UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

##### HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Ukrainian community in the United States. This month the Ukrainian National Association, the oldest Ukrainian organization in the United States, is celebrating 100 years of Ukrainian immigration to the United States. The culture of America has been greatly enriched by their presence in this great country. We have been most fortunate in inheriting their drive, their skills and the rugged independence of those Ukrainians who could no longer put up with life without freedom.

As all of you know, the Ukraine is one of the most important of the captive nations. It is unfortunate that because the independence of the Ukraine lasted but a short time, between the fall of the czar and the military take-

over of the Ukraine by the Bolshevik government under Lenin, some people tend to forget that the Ukraine was indeed, at one time, free. For 5 years, it had a separate political identity of its own. Since 1918, however, it has been incorporated into the territory of the U.S.S.R.

The Ukraine has had a long and distinguished history, with geographic and ethnic identities of its own. Of special importance has been the Ukraine's excellent agricultural production. For centuries, it has been the target for the aggression on the part of numerous European power. Who can forget the 7 million Ukrainians in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic who died of starvation during the period of 1932 to 1933. This was the result of the Soviet Russian Government targeting the Ukrainian people for genocide by directing special draconic decrees against Ukrainian peasants as enemy class, and against Ukrainian intelligentsia as bourgeois Ukrainian nationalists. Yet throughout all of these invasions and occupations, including the current one, the people of the Ukraine have maintained their fierce love of freedom, their bold sense of independence, and their individual integrity.

To seek their freedom, millions of Ukrainians came to America. They had firsthand knowledge of how communism can enslave men. They were poor and unschooled, but shared the dream of living in a free land. They worked hard in factories, mines, and on farms and helped to build America into an economic giant.

They have made significant contributions to enrich American life and our society. Americans of Ukrainian descent distinguished themselves in the academic world and in science as well as in the corporate sector. Americans of Ukrainian descent have entertained millions of television and movie viewers while others have had exemplary careers serving the Nation in our military.

They have transplanted their rich culture from their mother country to this new land and have enhanced the fascinating cultural mosaic of America. I admire them for their efforts to preserve their rich heritage for the future generations of Ukrainian-Americans. I salute the Ukrainian-American community and their celebration of 100 years of Ukrainian immigration to the United States.●

#### AMTRAK—TWO FOR THE PRICE OF ONE

##### HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, if the administration has its way, the United

States will be the only developed nation in the world without a national passenger rail service. Despite increasing ridership and decreasing reliance on Federal subsidies, Amtrak is slated for extinction under the proposed budget for fiscal year 1986.

A review of Amtrak's recent record and the effect of its elimination reveal the administration's plan to be penny wise and pound foolish. Over the last 14 years, the Federal Government has spent \$5.2 billion in upgrading the system's infrastructure and improving the service in the Northeast corridor between Boston and Washington. This investment is now beginning to pay off, with Amtrak transporting over 20 million passengers in 1984, an 18-percent increase over 1983 ridership, with its best ever on-time performance. This has come while the Federal Government's share of operating expenses has decreased, dropping from \$896 million in fiscal year 1981 to \$684 million in fiscal year 1985.

And what will it cost to dismantle the system? As The Boston Globe points out in the following editorial, 25,000 Amtrak employees, including over 700 in Massachusetts, would be laid off, costing the Federal Government an estimated \$2.1 billion in labor protection benefits.

The administration is giving the country a real bargain with this proposal—imprudent fiscal policy and short-sighted transportation policy—two for the price of one.

#### SAVING AMTRAK

The Amtrak rail passenger system was one of the achievements of the Nixon administration. Under the leadership of former Massachusetts Gov. John Volpe, who was then Secretary of Transportation, the Federal Government took over passenger service from the railroads, which had found it a money loser.

The arrangement has worked well. After a difficult transition, Amtrak's employees and managers have cooperated admirably to hold down costs and improve service. Last year the system carried 20 million passengers.

The Reagan administration proposes to shut down Amtrak to save \$684 million in annual subsidies. There would be no savings for some years, since the Government would have to pay more than \$2 billion in severance to the 25,000 employees who would lose their jobs, and it would have to write off more than \$3 billion in equipment and other assets.

It is misleading for the administration to assert that Amtrak competes unfairly with unsubsidized rival forms of transportation. All modes of transportation are subsidized, directly or indirectly. Buses do not pay for the full cost of the highways and streets that they travel. The Government sub-



dizes airlines by providing air traffic control.

Because air service is so much faster than rail service, Amtrak does not compete with the airlines for business passengers except on very short trips. The much higher price of air travel shows that business travelers would rather save time than money. The ordinary weekday fare between Boston and New York is \$25 for a 5-hour trip on Amtrak compared to \$65 for a 30-minute flight on the Eastern shuttle.

Amtrak, however, does compete with airlines for the business of low-income travelers of families with small children. It also competes with bus companies, which charge slightly less for a slightly faster trip. If it were to be put out of business, the bus lines would be free to raise their fares substantially, and low-income travelers would have no choice.

W. Graham Claytor, Jr., the chairman of Amtrak, points out that it is the only form of transportation that could move large numbers of people in a national emergency, and that in many small communities, it is the only transportation. If it were abolished, the United States would be the only industrial nation without a rail passenger system. Claytor has promised to wage a battle to save Amtrak. He deserves public and congressional support.●

**MS. WALMAR GRAY CELEBRATES 50 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH AMERICAN RE-INSURANCE CO. IN NEW YORK**

**HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the accomplishments of Ms. Walmar Gray of Forest Hills, NY, who on May 13, 1985, will celebrate her 50th year of service with American Re-Insurance Co.

Mr. Speaker, American Re-Insurance Co. is a subsidiary of the Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., a well-respected firm in New York. The company has reaped many benefits from Ms. Gray's years of service, and from the enthusiasm with which she approaches her job. As the retrospective premium accountant in the underwriting accounting department, Wally Gray performs the vital task of accumulating data needed for corporate financial reports, as well as servicing clients on an individual basis. Her top-notch work has made a significant contribution to the smooth and efficient operation of the underwriting accounting department, in conjunction with the leadership and direction of Assistant Vice President Kenneth Shefcik and the company's other fine officers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the many talents Wally has brought to American Re-Insurance is her skill in dealing with people. All of us have had occasion, in our interactions with businesses and institutions, to be put off or experience frustration with "the system." But clients of American Re-Insurance who work with Ms. Gray have had a very different experience. Her people-oriented approach to doing business has served the company well, and has been of great benefit to many New Yorkers. Walmar Gray, who is preparing to retire after her 50 years of invaluable service, will be greatly missed by American Re-Insurance and its clients.

I would like to congratulate Ms. Gray on her 50th anniversary with the company, and extend to her my best wishes for the future. She has made an important contribution to the city of New York, and I ask all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in celebrating with her 50 years of service with American Re-Insurance.●

**DR. WILLIAM J. REID**

**HON. JOE MOAKLEY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of the House the outstanding contributions by Dr. William J. Reid, to the Boston school system in particular South Boston High School, and the South Boston neighborhood itself.

Since 1936, Dr. Reid has taught in the Boston school system, beginning as a substitute teacher and working his way through the ranks to become headmaster of South Boston High School in 1965, where he set standards of education, and principles that further enriched the school, its students, and its reputation.

In addition to lecturing at various colleges around the State of Massachusetts, Dr. Reid to his credit, has also published a number of books dealing with Massachusetts history and government, and the Cape Cod Canal. Dr. Reid's highly respected reputation in the education field has been recognized with high honors, among them the Distinguished Service to Youth from the Massachusetts Secondary School Principals Association, and also the Award of Merit from the Youth Activities Commission from the city of Boston along with many others too numerous to name.

Dr. Reid's devotion to the Boston school system can only be surpassed by one element, and that is his commitment to the youth and the community of South Boston. Many residents of South Boston have seen first hand

the involvement that Dr. Reid has shown with the South Boston Boys & Girls Clubs, and the South Boston Youth Hockey League.

Both of these programs on which Dr. Reid had quite a positive impact, help nurture and guide young children on the road to adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present Dr. Reid, my fellow South Bostonian, and I know that my colleagues will join me in congratulating a most thoughtful man, whose devotion and generosity of spirit can always be counted on in the cause of education and the assistance to his community—South Boston.●

**ESPARANZA GUERRERO**

**HON. JIM KOLBE**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, this month, during National Small Business Week, a Hispanic woman from Arizona's Fifth Congressional District will be honored as National Minority Small Business Advocate of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration. Esperanza M. Guerrero, a senior consultant with Price Waterhouse in Tucson, AZ, was selected because of her dedication and work in helping minority small businesses gain access to financial and management assistance.

Esperanza Guerrero's achievements begin with community action. As a native Arizonian, she understands that the Hispanic community has a long history of contributions to the cultural and economic development of the Southwest. Professionals and volunteers like Ms. Guerrero remind us of our past, as well as our responsibility to the future. She is currently a member of the Hispanic Professional Action Committee and a volunteer at Casa de los Ninos, a crises nursery for children. Ms. Guerrero is a consultant with Chicanos Por La Causa, helping minority firms interested in security debt financing and has worked with local financial institutions to help firms get needed financing. She has worked for the Tucson Economic Development Corp. in relocating businesses to the area and with the Southwest Border Regional Commission as a liaison with business and government agencies on both sides of the United States-Mexico border.

The 14.2 million small businesses recognized during National Small Business Week are the foundation of our economy. This foundation crumbles unless men and women representing all ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds are welcome participants. The goal of the Federal Government should be to work as a partner with

communities, local leaders, and small businesses to foster the independence and entrepreneurship needed in a dynamic economy. For Hispanics, community and independence are not contradictory concepts—they form the basis for relationships that give people the support to realize their full potential.

I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Esparanza Guerrero on her outstanding contributions to American small business. The Hispanic community can be proud of her work, and all of us can learn from her as a professional and as a volunteer who represents our dreams for free enterprise and community involvement. ●

# BACH CHOIR OF BETHLEHEM, PA

## HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of my House colleagues the accomplishments of the Bach Choir of Bethlehem, PA, which is commemorating the 300th anniversary of the birth of Johann Sebastian Bach this weekend and next with its 78th Annual Bach Festival. Sir David Willcocks, director of music at King's College, Cambridge, England, director of the Royal College of Music in London, and also director of the Bach Choir of London, will be the guest conductor for the festival's performance of the B Minor Mass.

The Bach Choir of Bethlehem was founded in 1898 by Dr. J. Fred Wolle for the purpose of encouraging a greater interest in, appreciation of, and aesthetic and spiritual benefit from the choral and instrumental works, both sacred and secular, of Johann Sebastian Bach. The choir organization works to educate both its own members and the public in the works of Bach through the performance of his works under competent musical direction, to the end that the highest standards of performance may be achieved and the perfection of creative art may be maintained. The Bach Choir of Bethlehem is the oldest Bach Choir in the United States performing only the works of Johann Sebastian Bach. The first complete American performance of Bach's Mass in B Minor was given in Bethlehem in 1900.

The annual Bach Festival in Bethlehem is attended by music lovers from more than 30 States. The office of the choir serves as the national office for the American Chapter of the New Bach Society.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an article on the unique tercentenary

program that the Bach Choir of Bethlehem will be offering at the festival.

## TERCENTENARY PROGRAM HAS HISTORIC ROOTS

(By Alfred Mann)

It has been argued that anniversary programs pay artificial rather than genuine homage to the great composers, but history refutes this. Bach anniversaries have provided major impetus to the cultivation of Bach's work, and the first Festival of the Bach Choir of Bethlehem (on April 2, 1900), marking the sesquicentennial of Bach's death, was in itself an anniversary observance.

We have become more conscious of the Choir's own anniversary dates in recent years—the Choir's one hundredth performance of the Mass in 1972 and the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Choir's founding in 1973 were commemorated with programs of special significance—and the historic journey the Bach Choir of Bethlehem undertook in 1976 to perform at the International Bach Festival in Berlin and at Bach's church in Leipzig was in turn prompted by the country's Bicentennial.

When the time came to plan for the observance of this year's Bach Tercentenary—the three-hundredth return of Bach's birthday—the Bach Choir decided that the anniversary should be linked to Bach Choir history. It was eighty years ago that the Choir's founder, Dr. J. Fred Wolle, staged a Bethlehem Bach Festival different in format from all others because it was guided by a plan of performances that spanned the entire church year, celebrating the major feasts of the season with works Bach had written for the corresponding phases of the year.

Dipping into Choir history, Greg Funfgeld, Bach Choir director, has recreated this design, but with a different approach. The most notable departure reaches back to another gesture from the annals of Bethlehem Bach Festivals. Dr. Wolle was organist at Bethlehem's Central Moravian Church when the Choir was established, and on occasion he included in the Festivals some programs consisting entirely of organ music which he presented himself. The conclusion of this year's cycle of Bach concerts in Bethlehem will be marked by an organ recital of Marie-Claire Alain, famed French organist known in this country as "the first lady of the organ".

There is also a new point of view from which the works for the other programs were chosen. While there is some obvious overlap with Dr. Wolle's programs eighty years ago—the Magnificat will be heard at Christmas and the St. John Passion in a Lenten program—the other works to be performed were scheduled by an ingenious process of selection involving the whole Choir.

With appropriate pride in the extraordinary performance history of the Bach Choir of Bethlehem, its members were asked to cast a vote indicating their individual preferences from the eighty-five years of Bach programs. The results were integrated into the scheme of the year cycle, so that each work to be given represents a milestone in Choir history.

In the Christmas program, Cantatas 140 and 63 were included, the former being one of the works heard also in the Bethlehem Christmas program of 1904, and the latter having opened the program of 1971, which traced the outline of Bach's own first Christmas service in Leipzig.

The works of the May Festival program are a summary of high points from all Bethlehem programs: the B Minor Mass, preceded by cantatas and motets that stand out in Bach Choir memory.

There is a remarkable point of comparison between the Bethlehem Festival cycle of eighty years ago and the anniversary program of 1984-85. Dr. Wolle's project proved in the end too vast to be adjusted to the Bethlehem Festival format, and there was no further goal to attain. Dr. Wolle accepted the call from the University of California, and the Festivals came to a temporary end. With their eventual resumption in 1912, a pattern was established that in time has proved so sound and enduring that today's Bach Choir director was able to enter upon a full year's anniversary celebration with assurance of a firm tradition and many more special programs and anniversary celebrations to come.

I encourage my colleagues, especially those who represent neighboring districts, to visit Bethlehem, PA, during the 78th Annual Bach Festival to enjoy this fine musical event. The program for the festival follows:

## 1985 FESTIVAL PROGRAM

Friday Afternoons, May 10 and 17

Cantata BWV 78, Jesu, der du meine Seele  
Cantata BWV 147, Herz und Mund und Tat und Leben

Cantata BWV 137, Lobe den Herrn, den mächtigen König der Ehren

Friday Evenings, May 10 and 17

Cantata BWV 11 (Ascension Oratorio)  
Motet BWV 229, Komm, Jesu, komm  
Cantata BWV 74, Wer mich liebet, der wird mein Wort halten\*

Motet BWV 225, Singet dem Herrn

Saturday Mornings, May 11 and 18

A program of chamber and orchestral works

Saturday Afternoons, May 11 and 18

The Mass in B Minor

\*Festival premiere. ●

## RETURN RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT TO SOLVENCY

## HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent a district with a large number of railroad employees. In fact, my State, the State of Texas, is one of six States in the Nation with over 20,000 railroad workers. Consequently, I am keenly interested in the welfare of rail employees and retirees.

Unfortunately, one component of the rail system is currently facing financial distress. The railroad unemployment program has been chronically underfunded. In fact, the railroad unemployment fund has been forced to borrow from the railroad retirement fund for 19 of the past 24 years. Railroad unemployment now owes railroad retirement over \$700 million and the figure is growing.



On September 30, 1985, the authority for railroad unemployment to borrow from railroad retirement expires. We, in Congress, have two choices: We can act to return rail unemployment to solvency or we can do nothing and deny unemployed railroad workers their just compensation. No one supports the latter choice. Clearly, we must act and we must act rapidly.

As I explored the various proposals to return railroad retirement to solvency, I kept three basic criteria in mind. One, the plan must be fair to the unemployed. Two, the plan must be fair to railroad retirees. And, finally, the plan must be fair to the general taxpayers. I was distressed to find that the so-called consensus package, which has the support of rail carriers and rail labor, failed two of those three tests. The plan is not fair to rail retirees not to the taxpayers. I found it particularly difficult to stomach the plan's lack of fairness to railroad retirees.

The consensus package would require the forgiveness of the interest on railroad retirement's loans to railroad unemployment. While forgiveness of interest may seem minor, it is not. The dollar figure of interest due railroad retirement may ultimately range from its current low of \$200 to \$300 million to nearly \$3 billion. I cannot support a plan which would rob railroad retirees of money which is rightfully theirs. While some may claim that railroad retirement is in good financial condition and can spare the funds, my memory is not that short.

I remember a few short years ago when railroad retirement was on the brink of financial collapse. Railroad retirees faced drastic reductions in their benefits if Congress did not act to salvage the system. We, in Congress, passed legislation which required railroad retirees to take benefit reductions to gain the retirement system's solvency. I think it is unconscionable that a few short years after requiring benefit reductions from rail retirees, we would allow up to \$3 billion to be siphoned from the railroad retirement fund.

So, I am delighted to be an original cosponsor, today, of alternative legislation which meets all three of the criteria I originally set. First, the plan is fair to unemployed rail workers. Our bill would raise the daily benefit of an unemployed rail worker from its current maximum of \$25 per day to a maximum of \$35 per day. This figure is much more in line with the benefits of other unemployed workers in my State of Texas who receive up to \$37.20 per day.

Second, the plan is fair to rail retirees. It requires that all the principal and the interest on railroad retirement's loans to railroad unemploy-

ment be repaid. And, third, it is fair to the taxpayers who are not required to bailout the system at a time when our Nation is facing record budget deficits.

Our bill makes rail carriers shoulder the burden of their own rail unemployment system, as it should be. An average Texas employer with a similar workforce employment history to the railroad industry is required to pay approximately \$64 per employee, per month in unemployment taxes. In comparison, rail carriers, currently pay only \$30 per employee per month in unemployment taxes. Rail carriers are paying too little tax to fund rail unemployment. While raising rail unemployment taxes is unpleasant, it is necessary if railroad unemployment is to remain independent and to become financially sound. Our bill would increase the wage base on which unemployment tax must be paid from \$600 to \$1,300 per month, thus bringing rail carriers more in line with other businesses.

Mr. Speaker, this plan is balanced and realistic. It protects the interests of the unemployed, the retirees and the general taxpayer. I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this legislation. ●

#### PUBLIC HOUSING COMPREHENSIVE GRANT PROPOSAL

**HON. STEVE BARTLETT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleagues CHALMERS WYLIE, the ranking member of the House Banking Committee and STEWART MCKINNEY, the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee, I am introducing the Public Housing Comprehensive Grant Proposal. I am introducing this bill by request of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Secretary Pierce. This proposal has two purposes in reforming capital improvement funding for public housing.

(1) Deregulation.—It would give local public housing authorities the authority to develop their own comprehensive modernization plan, subject only to limited HUD review and an annual statement of work. This procedure contrasts with current detailed regulatory oversight by HUD.

(2) Formula Funding.—The bill would also replace the current application method with formula funding. Operating subsidies would continue to be funded with the performance funding system but the capital improvements funds would be distributed by a formula that includes a replacement reserve. This new disbursement system would allow fungibility between operations and capital budgets.

I personally commend Secretary Pierce and Assistant Secretary Lindquist for their leadership in proposing this initiative. The concept of this proposal is one that I and many others involved in public housing policy have been interested in for some time and I applaud the Department for its efforts.

The current modernization program, commonly referred to as a CIAP, is a highly regulated and cumbersome process for local public housing authorities. A public housing authority [PHA] must now ask HUD for permission before even deciding what kind of doorknobs to install. This proposal will allow PHA's the discretion to make those decisions while maintaining limited HUD oversight through an annual review process. By removing detailed HUD oversight public housing authority will be better able to implement a modernization process suited to its own local needs.

The second important feature of this proposal is a formula funding system that will replace the present application process for modernization funds for individual public housing authorities. Through formula funding, a public housing authority will receive reliable funding each year. This process will ensure that an individual public housing authority will receive funding on a regular basis. That funding would be predictable, reliable, and simplified.

I have discussed this proposal with many of my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle. I have also discussed this proposal with those involved in the day-to-day running of public housing authorities, and the comments and initial reaction have been favorable. I am introducing this proposal today to seek further comments and suggestions for changes, additions, deletions, and improvements.

I invite comments from my colleagues and those in the housing industry. Over the next several weeks and months, I will be considering improvements and I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development to prepare final legislation.

This legislation is sound in its present form, and substantially better than the current highly regulated system. I do anticipate refinement and improvements in a number of areas before final passage. For example, I believe fungibility between operating subsidy and capital improvements should be permitted, but limited; the 97 percent occupancy rate requirement should be examined; and distinction could be made between current needs and replacement reserve; and Congress should be involved in setting the criteria for the funding formula.

I will offer this proposal or a similar proposal as a part of the housing authorization bill that is being developed in the House Banking Committee. To further acquaint my colleagues with the purpose of this proposal I am inserting a summary of the provisions and the bill itself for the RECORD.

**SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC HOUSING  
COMPREHENSIVE GRANT PROPOSAL  
WHAT IS IT?**

The Public Housing Comprehensive Grant Program is a major reform proposal to the existing Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program [CIAP]. CIAP was created by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980. Basically, CIAP was created to provide financial assistance to PHAs for the purpose of undertaking comprehensive improvements (i.e. modernization) in the physical condition, energy conservation and management of PHA-owned rental projects. This program is commonly referred to as Comprehensive Modernization—i.e. COMP MOD.

**WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL?**

**Two Major Objectives:**

(1) Significant Deregulation of the Comprehensive Modernization Program by returning the program to local control—i.e. the local public housing authority.

(2) Greater reliability of funding for capital improvements through use of formula funding for future capital improvements and for current needs.

**PROBLEMS WITH EXISTING PROGRAM**

The current modernization program is an inefficient way to distribute resources for the capital improvement needs of the public housing inventory. It denies PHAs the flexibility and responsibility essential for setting priorities for capital improvement expenditures, weighing the needs of all projects against each other and the options of repair and major maintenance against capital replacement. Because HUD presently decides what to fund and when to fund it, PHAs cannot do rationale multi-year planning for the capital improvement needs of the existing public housing inventory now estimated to be worth in excess of \$60 billion.

The present program now imposes rigorous application requirements and applies them to all PHAs, regardless of management capability or the size of the PHA. The present program requires HUD scrutiny of the application and intensive HUD monitoring of the modernization activities. This overregulation creates unnecessary paperwork and delays, which in turn can drive up the costs of the rehabilitation work.

Funds from the capital improvement program and operating subsidies will be fungible (interchangeable) within the PHA.

The entire comprehensive grant is to be spent to make physical and management improvements, according to the needs and priorities locally set by the PHA.

The concept of local management flexibility will permit efficiency in the use of funds which cannot be achieved under a system dictated in detail from Washington.

The freedom from pervasive regulation and the increased reliability of funding will provide opportunity and incentives for efficient management.

The PHA will be able to set their own priorities, to choose among projects, to determine whether maintenance or capital improvements is most cost-effective in a particular instance and to realistically plan on

a multi-year basis knowing that they will have control in carrying out the plan.●

**ISSUES BRING BLACKS AND  
JEWS TOGETHER**

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the work that the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is doing in New England, under the leadership of Director Leonard Zakim, to highlight the many things which united the black and Jewish communities.

In the face of extremists on both sides who would prefer to see tensions between these two groups, Mr. Zakim has worked with black leaders in the Boston area and with other Jewish leaders to stress the many issues that draw black and Jewish Americans together. Recent articles in the Christian Science Monitor and the Boston Globe highlight the important work that the Anti-Defamation League is doing in this regard and I ask that they be printed here.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 22, 1985]

**THEATER SERVES AS A RALLYING POINT FOR  
BLACKS AND JEWS IN BOSTON  
(By Luix Overbea)**

BOSTON.—The racially mixed audience stood and applauded as the cast of "Martin" took its bows.

Offstage, the two men responsible for bringing the play about Dr. Martin Luther King to Boston beamed. To Leonard Zakim, New England director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and the Rev. Charles A. Stith, the evening marked another step toward healing a rift that has grown between blacks and Jews.

Two issues, affirmative action and the Rev. Jesse L. Jackson's presidential campaign, triggered misunderstanding between the two groups during the past year. This rift was particularly disturbing to leaders of both groups, which were closely allied during the civil rights struggles of the 1960s and '70s.

Blacks want affirmative action "with specific [usually numerical] job goals," says the Rev. Mr. Stith, pastor of the Union United Methodist Church here. Jews favor affirmative action "without quotas or numbers," Mr. Zakim says.

In addition, Jewish leaders and organizations openly opposed Mr. Jackson's candidacy. Their reasons: Jackson allegedly made an anti-Jewish epithet "off the record" during his campaign; and he never refuted one of his major supporters, Minister Louis Farrakhan, leader of the Nation of Islam, whom Jews criticize as anti-Semitic.

Zakim and Stith have worked together nearly five years to close what both call "a widening gap between two allies of the civil rights struggle." They have been supported by the Greater Boston Civil Rights Coalition, which Zakim helped found in 1979 after a series of racial incidents in Boston.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is as much a "drum major for peace" today as he was when he was leading nonviolent civil rights

and peace protests in the 1960s, say Zakim and Stith.

"Presenting 'Martin' is part of our ongoing efforts to enhance our relationships," Zakim said after its final performance recently. "Certainly we disagree at times, more often than we like, but we have much more in common than in conflict."

The performance of "Martin" before three integrated audiences—including one at a high school—was the third major cultural event within the past year initiated by Zakim and Stith to bring blacks and Jews together. And it marked the play's first performance outside of Atlanta, where it was written by Lamar Alford, playwright-in-residence of the Martin Luther King Jr. International Chapel at Morehouse College.

The other two cultural events were a pilgrimage of 19 Jews and blacks to Israel last September, and a Jewish Seder (commemorating the Passover, the exodus of the Children of Israel from Egypt) conducted earlier this month at Union United Methodist Church.

"Historically, blacks and Jews have had a unique relationship, but recently our friendship has been strained because of mistrust, misinformation, and lack of communication," Stith said of the two-week visit to Israel by a group from across the nation. "No one expected the tour to resolve our problems."

"We went to listen, to learn, and to appreciate each other's views," he said.

The two men say they hope to sponsor a national conference to bring blacks and Jews together, a project they hope will lead to a national movement. Both say they have received inquiries from other cities on how to start local reunification projects.

They brought "Martin" to the Hub "regardless of cost," Zakim says. "We saw the play in Atlanta and sought backing in Boston."

Local businesses responded with financing; congregations of all faiths and civil rights, community, and civic groups recruited the audiences, he says.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 10, 1985]

**A MUSICAL DRAMA REITERATES KING'S  
MESSAGE**

(By Wil Haygood)

Because he lived in times that were both virulent and passionate, and because like most leaders, he was complex, scholars, biographers, and playwrights will continue to examine the life of Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., the civil rights leader who walked across the bridges, inspired thousands, and was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize.

Lamar Alford, an Atlanta playwright, brings his musical drama, "Martin," to Boston for its first showing outside that city since it opened there four years ago. The drama will be presented tonight and tomorrow at Union United Methodist Church in the South End. It is being sponsored by a coalition of Boston civil rights groups and underwritten by the Bank of New England.

The life of King, who was assassinated on April 4, 1968, is a compilation of his times, and yesterday Alford discussed his work's genesis and King's soul.

The playwright, who has a pencil-thin mustache and was dressed in a dark blue linen suit, sat in the Cafe Tremont yesterday and, over breakfast, discussed the genesis of his play and the soul of King. He laid his straw hat to the side.

"I've tried to create the chronicle of a era—to deal with a community that was not



prepared to deal with history at that time," Alford said, adding that he deals with King as a historical figure, and also as a family man.

The play, which has a cast of 60, traces King's Atlanta childhood, then goes on to give life to the moments that galvanized the civil rights movement: King's 1964 March on Washington and "I Have A Dream" speech; his jailings; his pronounced opposition to the Vietnam War; and, finally his fateful trip to Memphis in 1968.

Alford, who was born in Montgomery, Ala., says of his birthplace: "Montgomery is a sleepy little southern town. And yet, in spite of itself, it answered the knock on its door when King came."

He says Montgomery's black community, particularly church leaders, backed King as he led the boycott of the city's segregated bus system. Alford's father was one of the people arrested during a protest.

"I remember my elementary school teacher pulling me and my sisters out of class. She said, 'Your father has been arrested.' I felt so proud. I'm sure I didn't truly understand what was going on in Montgomery but I felt proud that my father had been arrested for what he believed in."

Alford would enter Morehouse College in 1962. King attended Morehouse and upon his graduation in 1951, entered Boston University to do graduate work in theology.

"It is so important for people to be conformed with King's philosophy of nonviolence," Alford said. "And, in that respect", he continued, "the play is like a history lesson that comes alive."

The play, he said, has music in it from the '60s: some Supremes, some rock.

Alford was in the original 1971 cast of "Godspell" on Broadway and has also been a member of the New York City Opera. He is now dramatist-in-residence at Morehouse College.

He leaned over the breakfast table. His hands were folded in front of him, as if in prayer. "Now does not seem a popular time for groups to come together. Perhaps this play will bring about more of this needed coming together."

The 10 groups bringing "Martin" to Boston have long worked to promote racial harmony. Among them are the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the NAACP, the Black Ecumenical Commission, and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights.

It all began with a trip to Atlanta.

"In January, Rev. Charles Stith, [pastor of Union United Methodist Church], and I went down to Atlanta with some other church leaders to visit the King Center," Leonard Zakim, who was also at the breakfast, said. Zakim, executive director of the New England Chapter of the Anti-Defamation League and co-chairman of the Greater Civil Rights Commission, sat across from Timothy W. Kilduff, vice president of public affairs for the Bank of New England.

"Well," Zakim continued, "we were taking this tour through Morehouse College. We ran into Lamar (Alford) and he said, 'Hey, I have this play showing on campus, why don't you come over and check it out.'"

They went. They were "amazed and moved," Zakim said. "And," he continued, "I said to myself that this play should come to Boston." He said he saw it as a way to rekindle memories of the "very positive" relationships blacks and Jews have had through history.

"Sure, blacks and Jews have had their differences recently. But that's like any two communities. In general we are much more

together than we are apart. But most of the coverage last year [during Jesse Jackson's presidential bid], was negative and only focused on what blacks and Jews did not agree on."

During his presidential run last year Jackson was strongly criticized by the Jewish community for anti-Semitic comments and his refusal to denounce Louis Farrakhan, the Muslim leader who embraced the policies of the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

"King," said Zakim, "was a strong opponent of anti-Semitism."

"Relations in the South between blacks and Jews," said the playwright, "have always been strong." So they both hope the play will help heal any wounds.

Kilduff, of the Bank of New England, said his bank chose to underwrite the play because of the "collaboration" of the groups involved.

Some New York City Off-Broadway producers, Alford said with a flourish of his hands, are now interested in the play. That would, of course, put it right in the neighborhood of Broadway itself. Alford smiles and dreams of what the future may bring.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 29, 1985]

#### BREAD OF AFFLICTION

At sundown next Friday, Jews will observe the ancient rituals of the Passover seder. Throughout the ceremony there reverberates a call to remember. Those who take part recall not personal experience, but an ancestral memory of suffering and redemption. The seder enacts, in familial form, the historical consciousness of a people.

"This is the bread of affliction which our ancestors ate in the land of Egypt," the celebrants have said for millennia, to explain the symbolic significance of the unleavened matzoh. The unleavened bread, the bitter herbs and shankbone of a lamb—these are symbols of a story that Jews refuse to forget, even when they find themselves in relative safety. It is a story about slavery and liberation.

The Passover story contains a historical memory that Jews and black Americans can share, and this may be why the seder for Black-Christian Clergy and Laity, celebrated last night at St. Mark Congregational Church in Roxbury, has become an annual occasion for fellowship and dialogue between the black and Jewish communities of greater Boston.

At a time when black and Jewish Americans are feeling the intense divisive pressures that most minority groups have felt in American history, it is a *mitzvah* (blessing) for them to be sitting down to the Passover meal as members of the same family.

The seder is sponsored by the Jewish Anti-Defamation League and the Black Ecumenical Commission. Five years ago, the first time it was held, only seven clergymen attended it. It has grown each year, and last night 250 people attended it. Rev. Charles Stith and Rabbi Richard Yellin led them through the rituals and the telling of the Passover story. Participants were able to speak about the common problems of two peoples who have known the meaning of enslavement and persecution.

In this setting, the captivity of South African blacks can be a Jewish concern; the oppression of Soviet Jews can be felt as an affront to black Christians. The night of seder should not be entirely different from all other nights.

#### HAMMERSCHMIDT ADDRESSES THE AMERICAN LEGION

#### HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last night my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], the very able ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, was the principal speaker at the banquet session of the National Executive Committee Meeting of the American Legion in Indianapolis, IN.

There have been many articles written and much debate has taken place pertaining to benefits and services for veterans. I call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by our good friend from Arkansas because I think he has stated clearly not only his position, but the position of the overwhelming majority of Members of the House, relating to our commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that these remarks be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in view of the action in the House yesterday when we paid tribute to veterans in observance of the 40th anniversary of V-E Day:

Commander Bacon, distinguished members of the National Executive Committee of the American Legion, past national commanders, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen: May I first of all thank you sincerely for inviting me to come to the banquet meeting of your National Executive Committee. It is good for me to be able to pause in the midst of a congressional session and to reflect with each of you on a number of matters of mutual concern.

I am sure that your excellent legislative staff led by Phil Riggins and Paul Egan—together with your rehabilitation and economic staff—have advised you on the current status of these issues. Just yesterday, our House Committee on Veterans' Affairs acted on many of them. They involved compensation, medical care, jobs for veterans, G.I. loans, and national cemeteries. They also involved the Administration of Veterans Programs by the Veterans' Administration. In one meeting of the committee, we acted on some 40 separate and distinct proposals, most of which are subjects of American Legion official positions. Let me mention just a few of them that I consider very important and upon which your organization has mandates from your last national convention.

Firstly, our committee doesn't intend to let the 58 regional offices of the Veterans' Administration be consolidated into 3 locations. Just the opposite is true. If we prevail through the entire congressional process, at least one regional office in every State will exist as a matter of law and once and for all this consolidation proposal that comes to us every few years will have been put to rest.

Our committee has also expressed its will on two other matters of more than passing interest to the American Legion. In sense of the Congress resolutions we reported to the

full House of Representatives our opposition to any increase in fees on the origination of G.I. loans, and we made it very clear that any idea of taxing the compensation of disabled service connected veterans has absolutely no support in the Congress of the United States.

As to this latter proposal, I must state to you that it is not even officially before the Congress. It is merely someone's thought over at the Treasury Department in terms of making a recommendation to the President. It is my hope that the idea will never even go to the White House from Treasury, but if it does, I trust it will be summarily discarded. In any event, I can tell you that it will never see the light of a legislative day in the Congress. Of that you can be certain.

In a more positive vein, other legislation reported by our committee is intended to improve the VA Medical Program in several different ways. We want to pass legislation to meet medical needs of the aging veteran. We know that these needs are going to require a dynamic approach as veterans reach their golden years and we want VA to be ready to meet the challenge.

I know that the Legion is very concerned about a crisis situation in VA medicine with respect to recruitment of certain medical and administrative employees. An otherwise good governmentwide attempt to reduce the number of high-grade employees and thereby save Federal money has failed to take into account that VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery already had a good record in this regard. By applying a total Government reduction to such employees equally in both the agencies with good records and those not so good, VA has been very adversely affected, particularly as to psychologists, social workers, and pharmacists. The legislation we reported yesterday is designed to correct this situation. The Legion can take considerable credit for this action. Your national survey about the crisis gave our committee valuable information that gave impetus to our action.

In the compensation area, we are delaying action for the moment on a cost-of-living increase. We have determined in our committee that such increases should be consistent with all other entitlement programs. For instance, if Social Security goes up by a certain percentage, it is our view that compensation, which holds an even higher priority on the national agenda, should also go up by at least that same percentage.

Let me dwell on this subject for just a moment. When the various veterans' organizations have had representatives before our committee over these past few months we have asked repeatedly, "What would be your view if all entitlements were frozen?" Almost without exception, these representatives said that their organizations understood the tremendous deficit problem of our country and that if all these other entitlements were frozen—including Social Security—they would be willing to do their part and that their organizations would forgo COLA increase requests. The American Legion was in the forefront of these kinds of statements and I want to commend you not only for your view but for your leadership in a most difficult area. It is an example of patriotism at its very best and in the finest traditions of the American Legion.

Quite frankly, I don't want to predict how this issue will finally be resolved. But no matter what is finally decided, the record will clearly show that the Legion was in the forefront of being willing to sacrifice one of its major goals in order to assist in achieving national fiscal responsibility.

I said earlier that I know that your legislative representatives keep you well informed. I know therefore that you are up to date on the G.I. loan issue, the national cemetery issue, the servicemen's group life issue, and all the rest. I know, too, that you are up to date on VA's budget.

With respect to the budget, in my opinion VA has fared rather well—thus far at least. All of us know that our Nation is faced with a huge deficit problem. We do ourselves no justice if we ignore it. But we also do ourselves and the agency of Government called the Veterans' Administration no justice either if we ignore its special needs. For my part, those special needs require special consideration by the Congress. When I say special, I do not mean that we ought not to be financially frugal in our recommendations. But I have often stated and I now repeat my philosophy of Government as it pertains to the veterans of this Nation.

This Member of Congress believes that:

Those who served our country in time of war deserve a special status among our citizenry.

Adequate benefits for those who were disabled by their military service must be the prime concern of the Congress and the people of this Nation.

Benefits for America's disabled veterans are not a drain on the American taxpayer; those benefits are a continuing cost of war.

Veterans of our Nation's wars must never become public charges.

And finally, I state to you that any position on any matter that is inconsistent with what I have just said will have my unrelenting opposition and any position that is in accord with it will have my unrelenting support.

Mr. Commander, our Nation lives in difficult and challenging times. Representative Government always does. But in terms of benefits for veterans, I believe our country has every reason to be very proud of itself. We have the best veterans program of any Nation in the world. We do more for our veterans than anyone else. History clearly shows that we do not shrink from our responsibilities nor from our challenges. We accept those responsibilities and we welcome those challenges.

In this land called the United States of America, there are those who often have divergent military, social and economic agendas. There are those who have fortunately not actually been personally involved in war and on occasion perhaps they lack full understanding of what the Nation owes to those who have fought those wars. But, we ought to note that these are not bad or evil people nor—in my view—are they anti-veteran people. They may be uninformed and they may need education, and if that be true, our task—yours and mine—is clear. We must inform, and we must educate.

You of the American Legion have been doing this for generations and you will be doing it for generations to come. And I applaud you for that.

And now, let me mention a little bit of philosophy which I am certain you share in great abundance.

America has a soul and because of this she finds nothing pleasant about war. After the Spanish-American War, Secretary of State Hayes is quoted as having said that it was a "splendid war." On still another occasion, he described it as a "jolly war." I do not know what prompted those remarks and perhaps I take them out of context, but to me nothing about war is splendid and nothing about it is jolly. On the contrary, you and I

are reminded daily of the horror of war for we deal with its most tragic consequences \* \* \* all involved with horrible memories, heartache and suffering. Both personally and officially, we know war for what it really is and we have a bitter distaste for it.

But with that distaste we also have a quiet confidence that our Nation has waged war only when it had no other choice.

We also have a quiet confidence that when war is ended our Nation has a conscience that is second to none in the world. That conscience has created an unequalled program for our Nation's veterans. The American Legion has been a grand architect of that program and it has a right to an unequalled pride. You need never be ashamed to proclaim the goodness of that great effort. You have greatly assisted in creating the best medicine; the best benefits; the best ideal; and yes, too, the best dream.

And it is not bad to dream. When we have had imperfections in the past you have dreamed of their correction, and corrections have come about. When there have been doubts about VA's future, VA has survived and become stronger, and had more vitality, and the doubts have subsided. The record is clear that your efforts and the efforts of those of kindred spirits have been primarily responsible.

Commander Bacon, you and your associates meet at a time of historical memories. Today, May 8, we commemorate the 40th anniversary of the allied victory in Europe. A few months later the war far across the world from Europe also came to an end. These worldwide conflicts to overcome unspeakable tyranny saw our Nation enter a period of uneasy peace that was to be shattered later in Korea and then in Vietnam. From these three wars, and the one of a generation before, came the membership of the American Legion. That membership is a bulwark of strength for our country. Your motto speaks of God and country and expresses a deep respect and reverence for each. That respect and that reverence—and the actions to which they have given birth—are the essence of the goodness of a Nation that is truly blessed.

And now let me conclude, Mr. Commander, by mentioning a statement you recently made concerning the President's visit to Germany. During that visit he placed a wreath at a cemetery where German soldiers are buried. The advance word of this ceremony caused consternation in many areas, including the ranks of your organization. The ceremony is now over and in its wake you publicly commented that the President's statement at the wreath laying was excellent. You said that he mentioned his hopes for friendship with the German people, his hopes for freedom in the world, his hopes for reconciliation, his understanding and grief concerning the great trials and tribulations suffered by the Jewish community at the hands of the Nazis and finally his gratitude for the contributions of the veterans of this Nation. Finally, Mr. Commander, you stated your belief that the President would never purposely show insensitivity to any group. These remarks were to the point, and I associate myself with them. Strong feelings have been expressed about this entire event. Pent up emotions in such a situation are perfectly understandable. Speaking for the American Legion, you said forcefully what you had to say before the President's visit to Germany and now you have said what needed to be said in its aftermath. I congratulate you for



your forthrightness in both of these instances.

These recent events and the commemoration of V-E Day remind us that the American Legion is a creature of America's wars. You have a solemn resolve which is captured by Lincoln's precious words as to the veterans of those wars. I share that resolve and I share your belief in the greatness of the American people. I also share your resolute determination to assure that our Nation's veterans will always have a benefits program that will be—and ought to be—the very definition of the American ideal. This is an ideal which says that we are all—each in our own way—the disciples of a splendid hope for those who have defended freedom here at home and around the world. It is a hope that there will be complete fulfillment of your very legitimate aspirations for a good today but a better tomorrow. Those who have honorably worn the uniform of our land in its times of national and international peril deserve no less from all of the American citizenry.

The blessings of our land are perhaps not always fully appreciated by some; but I know that they are fully appreciated by those who are in this audience. It is an honor indeed to be asked to speak to the leaders of the American Legion and I am most grateful that you would ask that I share these moments with you.

Thank you—each of you—so very much. ●

#### THE CHILDREN OF THE WORLD

##### HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, every day, we witness troubling events throughout the world. War, terrorism, famine, poverty, and countless other ills make up the bulk of daily newscasts. In such an environment, it is useful to take time to reassert certain values that provide the young people of today with guidelines for a better world and hope for a brighter future. Two distinguished Americans from my community of Cleveland, Dr. Nicholas A. Bucur and Dr. Nolen Ellison, have written a "Manifesto to the Children of the World" that I comment to my colleagues' attention and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

#### MANIFESTO BY AND FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE WORLD

To: Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, and the people of the United States.

And to the people of the world,

Be it known to one and all, and to whom it should concern:

That the authors of this Manifesto, having been born into this troubled and violent world, and once having been children of the world, do hereby take it upon themselves to speak in the name of all of the children of the world, whoever and wherever they be, regardless of their race, nationality, creed, origin, personal situation and political or economic circumstances, and hereby do speak in one voice:

"Having been born into this life I am an heir to all that has happened before and to all that is. This life is mine. This world is

mine. The future is mine. I was born as an innocent, vulnerable and impressionable infant, with an open mind and pure heart. My elders molded me into what I am now. But in many ways they have failed. Worse, some of them, who are fanatics and terrorists, have infected me with hatred and violence. I am appalled by the economic imbalance of my world and by the violence, prejudice, discrimination, crime and terrorism rampant in my world. I yearn to live in peace with my fellow human beings. I seek to contribute of myself to my world, if I am allowed, in an atmosphere of peace.

I believe that I have been endowed with certain natural and inalienable rights, the enjoyment of which impose upon me corresponding duties to my community, to my world and to myself. I believe that I am entitled to basic and adequate food, shelter, care, security, training and love; and that I have not only the duty to share my knowledge and experience with my peers, but I have a right to do so.

I declare that I have the right to be respected for what I am, and that my right to believe as I choose must be respected by others, just as I must respect similar rights of others. My cultural heritage and beliefs are mine and sacred to me and I recognize that each person is entitled to hold her and his origin and beliefs equally sacred.

I have the right to be trained to my highest potential and to learn basic human values and thus be able to grow intellectually and ethically. I have the right to be taught the ways of peace, even in my infancy and my earliest stages of growth, and to learn the techniques of discussion and persuasion so as to be able to use such methods in my daily life. I must learn to express compassion, with good will, for these qualities are human and naturally mine. Thus, even as a very young child I should be instructed by gentle means to talk, listen, and negotiate, rather than resort to the use of violence, so that as adults I and others like me would use peaceful means to resolve our differences.

On a larger scale, I have the right to live in a free nation and in a world where the larger nations respect the rights of the small nations. But this does not always happen, and while I long for and shall work for peace I know that I have the duty to defend my family, my nation, and myself, against unjust aggression and invasion.

Although I intensely desire peace and seek universal disarmament, I recognize that no single nation can unilaterally disarm in a world full of suspicion. Nevertheless, I urge my elders and peers to stop the present irrational dash to self-destruction before it is too late. Let it be done now, so that I may live.

I respectfully and urgently call upon the leaders and the peoples of the world to take such steps as will halt terrorism and wars, and at the same time, to establish such organizations as will undertake the task of implementing the goals of this Manifesto; and to create that methodology which can be utilized to train those who can teach children everywhere the ways of peace so that I, and other children, can invent, create, and dream, and so that we can all attend to the real tasks of the world, instead of arming for war, such as the care of the ill, the disabled and elderly human beings.

As a child my world is free of malice and the world is full of wonder. Let it so remain. Teach me to choose what is good, and to love beauty, truth and justice. Endow me with character, good-will and compassion.

Teach me to reject falsehood, hatred, suspicion and violence. Teach me to improve the quality of our lives. Teach me to love knowledge and the communication of it to others. Help me to create a world free of fear, illness, pollution, want, and insecurity. Teach me the great principles of peace espoused by great men of the past and the present.

Teach me to dream great dreams. I want to dream. I want to aspire to greatness. From my ranks have come the giants of humanity. If I live, many more like them will inevitably arise.

I call upon my parents, my family, my peers, my teachers, my elders, and my leaders, to join me in this cause.

Children of the world, join me so that we may live.

Elders of the world, heed me now. For I am the future.

Listen to me. Now.

Let me live, so that you may live."

The authors of this Manifesto, in the name of the children of the world, call upon the leaders and the peoples of the world to join together, to unite their efforts, and to do what is necessary, in order to seek world peace through education and the cultivation of our humanity.

The task is long and hard, but the cause is crucial. Humanity's survival is at stake. It is not impossible.

Let all individuals and groups support the goals of this Manifesto so that every child, and all children, can grow and flourish, like flowers of every hue and kind, in a future world which can truly be a garden.

DR. NICHOLAS A. BUCUR.  
DR. NOLEN ELLISON.<sup>1</sup>

#### RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SOLVENCY ACT OF 1985

##### HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with my colleagues in introducing legislation to establish a more equitable and financially viable railroad unemployment insurance system while at the same time retaining the independent nature of the present system. The future of this system is crucially important to the approximately 41,000 furloughed rail workers who currently are receiving benefits, including over 3,600 workers in my State of Pennsylvania. In addition, the financial health of the unemployment system has a direct impact on the financial security of railroad retirees since the unemployment system has often been able to pay benefits only by borrowing money from the railroad retirement pension fund.

The financial problems facing the current railroad unemployment system are nothing new. The system has had to borrow from the railroad retirement account in 19 of the last 24 years. We cannot afford, and our railroad retirees cannot afford, to delay addressing these problems any longer. The indebtedness of the unemploy-

ment system to the railroad retirement account now exceeds \$700 million. Despite the strength of our current economic recovery, the unemployment system's indebtedness is expected to grow to over \$780 million by the end of this fiscal year, when existing borrowing authority expires. Prospects for repayment of the loans extended by the railroad retirement account, much less the interest owed on the loans, appear dim. In my opinion, the situation truly is reaching crisis proportions.

The financial problems with the railroad unemployment system are further complicated by a serious underfunding of unemployment benefits by rail carriers. Railroad carriers pay only about \$30 a month per employee to fund the railroad unemployment system. This is far below the contributions employers with employment records comparable to the rail carriers must pay under the Federal-State unemployment systems. In Pennsylvania, the cost to these employers is over \$81 a month per employee.

The inequity of the current railroad unemployment insurance system extends to the amount of benefits paid to rail workers. Under the current system, unemployed rail workers receive a maximum benefit of \$25 a day or \$125 a week. This amount has not been increased since 1972 and actually is lower than the unemployment benefits paid under 42 of the 50 State unemployment programs. Again, in Pennsylvania, the daily benefit in comparison is \$46.40, or \$232 per week.

In an attempt to remedy these obvious inequities, Congress must enact legislation to establish a financially sound system to fund railroad unemployment benefits by October 1. Congress must find a real solution that is fair to rail pensioners, rail employees, the rail industry, and the American taxpayer. The final solution cannot include open-ended borrowing from either the general treasury or the railroad retirement account, add to the Federal deficit, rely on Federal subsidies or grants, suppress unemployment benefits, or fail to provide for the repayment of loans from rail pensioners, including all interest.

Rail carriers admit their support for an independent unemployment system, as opposed to the administration's proposal to merge the current system with the Federal-State unemployment system. However, if rail carriers are to maintain an independent unemployment system, they should expect to pay for its full costs, including worker unemployment benefits comparable to the States' programs, all of the interest owed to the rail pension fund, and repayment of the principal within a reasonable term. Rail carriers should not expect a free ride from the American taxpayer or the railroad retirees.

The legislation we are introducing today would establish financially viable railroad unemployment insurance system that is fair to railroad workers and pensioners, the railroad carriers, and the American taxpayer. It retains the independent nature of the current system but makes two important changes.

First, it increases the maximum daily benefit afforded unemployed rail workers to \$35 from its current, unrealistically low level of \$25. While still below the level of Federal-State unemployment benefits paid in my State of Pennsylvania, it is an important step toward having railroad workers receive benefits comparable to what they would have received under the Federal-State system. The benefit increase also ensures that rail carriers pay the accurate costs of an independent unemployment insurance system.

Second, this legislation increases the wage base for the unemployment tax from \$600 per month to \$1,300 per month, with a conforming increase in the wage base for the repayment tax that is scheduled to start in July 1986. Increasing the wage base from \$600 to \$1,300 should increase receipts sufficiently to pay for the increased benefit and the interest owed annually on the outstanding loan from the railroad retirement account, to repay the moneys owed the retirement account within the next 15 years, and to make the railroad unemployment insurance system solvent. This increase in receipts eliminates the need for the unemployment system to borrow from the railroad retirement account or any other fund.

The legislation we are introducing today places the full burden of supporting the railroad unemployment system on the rail carriers. At first glance this may seem harsh, but this is exactly what occurs for every other business in America. In light of the successes of railroad deregulation, there is no reason to continue to shelter rail carriers and to expect railroad workers and retirees to continue to shoulder the burden of an independent railroad unemployment insurance system. The tax increases contemplated by this legislation are large, but not excessive when compared with the taxes paid by other employers with comparable employment experience and the fact that the railroad unemployment insurance system has been chronically underfunded.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must act soon to develop a financially sound railroad unemployment system before the borrowing authority expires this fall. We need reform in this area, not an extension of the status quo. We invite our colleagues to join us in fashioning a solution that will be sensitive to all of the interests involved in this matter, particularly those of the railroad worker, the railroad pensioner, and

the American taxpayer. We urge our colleagues to study this issue and become cosponsors of this important legislation. ●

#### LAKE GASTON PIPELINE PROJECT

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to prohibit the Secretary of the Army from issuing certain permits in connection with a proposed water pipeline project until an environmental impact statement for that project has been completed.

My colleagues, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. DAN DANIEL of Virginia, join me in reintroducing this legislation.

This project is the controversial Lake Gaston pipeline project, a proposal to divert 60 million gallons of water per day from Lake Gaston, NC, a part of the Second Congressional District, to be used as a water supply for the residents of the city of Virginia Beach, VA.

My constituents and I are very concerned about the proposal to divert such a large quantity of water out of the Roanoke River basin. We are particularly concerned that the U.S. Corps of Engineers has handled the permit for this massive project with haste, partiality, and completely inadequate documentation of its environmental and economic effects.

Because the Lake Gaston pipeline project will have widespread environmental impact, because it involved irrevocable commitment of more water than is presently used by any city in either North Carolina or Virginia, because it could set a major water use precedent, and because it is the subject of great public concern and controversy, it seems clear to me that an environmental impact statement should be required before a permit would be issued. I would also like to add that the State of North Carolina requested an environmental impact statement on the project at the very beginning of the permit process. For reasons that I cannot understand, the Norfolk District of the Corps of Engineers made a decision that an environmental impact statement would not be required even before the public was consulted about the project.

After making this initial decision, the Corps of Engineers has stuck to this position despite the documentation provided by many interested parties and despite the calls for an environmental impact statement by dozens of elected officials and by hundreds of citizens.



Mr. Speaker, last year, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development directed the Army Corps of Engineers not to spend funds available to it for administering the Lake Gaston pipeline project permit until the completion of a careful environmental study, that is, an environmental impact statement. I have been dismayed to learn that the corps, speaking through its acting chief counsel, said last September—1984—that it intends to complete absolutely no environmental impact statement in the absence of the full Congress and the President.

My constituents and I know that using Kerr Lake water storage for the Lake Gaston pipeline will cause additional fluctuations in the level of Kerr Lake. We are already having some severe problems during dry periods with low water levels which cause boat ramps to be unusable and create navigation hazards. There have been several different studies of the effect of the pipeline. The estimates of the additional drawdown in Kerr Lake differ widely. We badly need an environmental impact statement to determine what the effects of this project on Kerr Lake will be.

We are also greatly concerned about the effects of the project in reducing flows in the Roanoke River downstream, from Roanoke Rapids Lake. We have some rapidly growing needs for water in this area for industry, municipal use, and for agriculture irrigation. We are frustrated that the Corps of Engineers has not even attempted to make a basinwide projection of water use over the 50 year planning period. The Corps of Engineers has granted a permit that will permanently commit a large amount of water to a user approximately 100 miles away without really determining how much water is needed in the basin. We are also concerned that the reduction in flows of water during dry periods will aggravate some water-quality problems that we are already experiencing.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned about the real economic and environmental impact that the Lake Gaston project will have on the Roanoke River basin. We are also upset about the way in which this fundamental decision is being made. Since the beginning of our efforts requesting the corps to undertake a full, impartial environmental impact statement, I think that we have shown that the Corps of Engineers has attempted to rush this through rather than giving the public the materials that it needs to really understand what is being done.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking support for the bill we are reintroducing today which will do just one thing: it will give interested citizens in both Virginia and North Carolina a fair and objective assessment of this project.

Virginia Beach is a fine city and has a serious need for water. Yet, in this case, adequate study has not been given to the impact of the project and the alternative sources of water supply. Instead of a careful decision-making process, the Corps of Engineers has taken a hasty and careless approach with total disregard for public concern. This imprudent action by the corps forces us to come to the Congress for a remedy that should have been granted by administrative decision.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my statement.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

H.R. 2467

A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Army from issuing certain permits in connection with a proposed water pipeline project until an environmental impact statement for that project has been completed

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army may not issue a permit under section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899 (30 Stat. 1121; 33 U.S.C. 403), or under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. § 1344) for the construction of a water supply pipeline and related structures for removing water from Lake Gaston (a lake within the States of North Carolina and Virginia) and transporting water to the city of Virginia Beach, Virginia, or the surrounding area, before a full environmental impact statement as described in section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) is completed for the pipeline project.

#### A VETERAN'S MEMORIES OF V-E DAY

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for many Americans, the celebration this week of the 40th anniversary of Victory in Europe Day brought back memories of elation over the allied victory in Europe and at the same time feelings of sorrow for the thousands of brave Americans who were killed and injured in this great effort.

Nash Stublen, a reporter for the Tampa Tribune, recalled in a column Wednesday, some of his personal experiences while serving in the 29th Infantry Division during the final days and hours before V-E Day. Nash reminds us that even in victory, it's impossible to forget the horror of death and destruction associated with war. His words are a powerful reminder of the great toll that was taken in World War II, and I would like to share his column with my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Tampa Tribune, May 8, 1985]

ON THE BANKS OF THE ELBE, V-E DAY  
ANTICLIMATIC FOR THESE SOLDIERS  
(By Nash Stubler)

It was a relatively easy advance for the 29th Infantry Division on April 25, 1945, to its final World War II stop at Germany's Elbe River.

WWII, as Archie Bunker called it, was winding down in Europe. The jig the Fuehrer had danced when the Germans occupied Paris was almost up for Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany would surrender to the Allies within two weeks.

The 29th had come a long way across Western Europe since its landing on the Normandy beaches on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

While I missed the invasion, the hedgerow-to-hedgerow fighting across the French countryside and the capture of the heavily fortified Port of Brest, I was assigned to the Blue and Gray division as a replacement in time for the bloody battle for Aachen in the first assault across the German border from Holland.

We were prepared to fight across the Roer River to the northeast in December 1944 when the Germans made their final thrust in what is known as the Battle of the Bulge.

We escaped the German onslaught but were left exposed on the left flank of the bulge. We dug in on a farm for a month's delay.

My heavy machine-gun squad virtually dug a small, two-room apartment underground, outfitted with a stove, adjacent to the machine-gun emplacement.

Just before midnight on Christmas Eve, we heard the Germans singing carols and joyous shouts apparently from soldiers who had had too much to drink.

This irritated one American officer who got a map of Julich, the city across the river, and designated targets for every weapon available. "We're going to break out their window panes," was the word from the top.

At midnight, everyone fired toward the other bank for 15 minutes. When my ears stopped ringing, there was silence across the river.

What had sounded like a good idea left me depressed. At least someone was getting to celebrate Christmas Eve and we had spoiled it.

We finally fought our way across the river. No one had time to see whether we had actually broken out any window panes.

The rest of the push to the Elbe was downhill compared to previous battles.

We were in the town of Klatze on the Elbe when a group of ragged Polish people seemed to come out of the woodwork.

Remembering a men's clothing store I had seen earlier, a couple other guys and I gathered up about a half-dozen of the Poles and marched them to the store.

Without hesitation I threw a brick through the window and we outfitted the Poles with new clothes.

Three days later, on April 30, I was on duty at my gun emplacement on the bluff overlooking the Elbe when I spotted a white flag on the other side. I radioed to my company headquarters what I saw.

It was an advance party of a German V-2 rocket division that had outrun the Russians to surrender to the Americans. On the same day, Hitler had married his long-time mistress, Eva Braun, and they both had committed suicide.

After the surrender was officially executed, an engineering battalion made arrangements to bring the 10,000-man division across the Elbe on May 1 and 2. Disappointed that I couldn't take part, a fellow soldier, who spoke fluent German, and I found a rowboat and crossed the river. We sneaked up the road on which the German convoy was traveling. In German, my cohort shouted "throw out your weapons."

More than 25 did from German Lugars to what looked like a six-shooter from the Wild West days. When one German threw out an unarmed hand grenade, we decided it was time to take leave.

We placed the guns in a towbag and headed back across the river in the boat, which almost sank from the new weight.

When our platoon lieutenant heard what we had done, he was so mad I thought we would surely be court-martialed. He eventually cooled down, though, after we gave him and other members of the platoon souvenir weapons.

Victory in Europe was proclaimed May 8, the day after the surrender. While there were big celebrations on the home fronts, it brought no shouts of joy in that small town on the Elbe. The announcement was anticlimatic to the men of the Blue and Gray.●

#### CONGRESS MUST ACT TO HELP IN THE FIGHT AGAINST DRUGS

**HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1985, 2 tons of cocaine—worth more than \$1 million—were confiscated within 2 hours Wednesday in two of this country's biggest narcotics seizures ever. On Biscayne Bay, FL, the U.S. Coast Guard chased three smugglers until they jumped overboard and abandoned their speedboat. The Coast Guard found the speedboat packed with 1,909 pounds of cocaine. One man was arrested, but two escaped. Later that day, in Miami, police stopped a camper and found 2,100 pounds of cocaine inside. Two men were charged. A routine police check of a second camper turned up 2,094 pounds of marijuana and resulted in two additional arrests.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of our law enforcement officials involved in these record drug busts. As a former sheriff, I am well aware of the dangers and bodily risks involved in such operations. The amount of drugs involved in these cases is a vivid example that drug trafficking and drug smuggling in this country remains a serious problem. Action must be taken to isolate the big-time drug dealers.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 994, the Controlled Substances Penalties Act of 1985, that would address this problem head on. My bill would deny bond in cases involving bulk amounts of narcotic drugs. In the case of cocaine, if one is arrested for dealing or smuggling a kilogram or more, bond would be denied and if convicted,

the penalties would be increased. For other narcotic drugs the no-bond provision and the stiffer penalties would apply in those cases involving 2 or more kilograms. Under my bill, first offenders in these categories would be subject to up to 30 years in prison or up to \$500,000 in fines. Second offenders would be subject to up to life imprisonment or, if the offender kills someone, he or she would be subject to the death penalty option.

My bill may seem too harsh or severe for some of my colleagues. But when one examines the scope and nature of domestic and international drug trade, one will discover how large this problem has become. Drug abuse in this Nation continues to ravage our youth and drain our society. In addition to being a sheriff, I was also a drug counselor for 10 years. I have seen the tragic consequences of drug abuse. Those ultimately responsible for the poisoning of our youth and the ravaging of our way of life are the kingpin drug dealers who are responsible for the massive influx of narcotic drugs into this country.

In too many instances these drug kingpins—if apprehended—post bond, which is usually set quite high, and then flee the country. My bill would ensure that these drug kingpins stand trial and that, if convicted, they pay dearly for their crimes. Recent events have shown that these drug kingpins have openly declared war against our law enforcement officers in the field. We need to enact tougher laws to protect our law enforcement officers and to protect our society from poisonous drugs. We are in a war—whether we like it or not. It is a war we must win. Passage of H.R. 994 would send a powerful message to the entire world that America has had enough and that we are serious about fighting drugs.

I urge all of my colleagues to take a good look at H.R. 994 and lend it their full support.●

#### LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR THE SOLVENCY OF THE RAIL- ROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSUR- ANCE SYSTEM

**HON. DAN COATS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues in introducing legislation to address the financial problems facing the railroad unemployment insurance system. The future of this system is crucially important to the approximately 41,000 furloughed rail workers who are currently receiving benefits. Further, since the unemployment system has often been able to pay benefits only by borrowing money from

the railroad retirement pension fund, the financial health of the unemployment system has a direct impact on the financial security of railroad retirees.

The financial problems facing the railroad unemployment system are nothing new. The system has had to borrow from the railroad retirement account in 19 of the last 24 years. But we cannot afford to delay addressing these problems any longer. The indebtedness of the unemployment system to the railroad retirement account now exceeds \$700 million. Despite the strength of our current economic recovery, the unemployment system's indebtedness is expected to grow to over \$780 million by the end of this fiscal year. Prospects for repayment of the loans extended by the railroad retirement account, much less the interest owed on the loans, appear dim. The situation is truly reaching crisis proportions, which will be only further aggravated when the unemployment system's borrowing authority expires September 30, 1985.

Congress must enact legislation to establish a financially sound system to fund unemployment benefits by October 1. Congress must find a real solution which is fair to rail pensioners, rail employees, the rail industry, and the American taxpayer. By this, I mean that the solution cannot include open-ended borrowing from either the General Treasury or the railroad retirement account, add to the Federal deficit, rely on Federal subsidies or grants, suppress unemployment benefits, or fail to provide for the repayment of loans from railroad pensioners, including all interest.

The administration's proposal to remedy this situation is to merge the railroad unemployment system with the Federal-State unemployment system. While I have not reviewed this possibility in great detail, I understand that merger would yield some significant advantages over the current system. First, under the current railroad unemployment system, a beneficiary receives a maximum of \$25 a day or \$125 per week. This amount has not been increased since 1972 and is lower than the unemployment benefits paid under 42 States' unemployment programs. Additionally, merger would end the rail unemployment compensation discrimination against rail employees with less than 10 years' service. Railroad pensioners would also benefit by relieving the financial burden on the railroad retirement system.

However, during the hearing on the administration's proposal before the Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation, and Tourism, it was quite evident that the rail carriers had withdrawn their support for merger, and are now supporting retention of an independent railroad unemployment



system under a "consensus" package presented to Congress by the Railroad Unemployment Compensation Committee.

After reviewing the "consensus" package, I find it fails the litmus test of fairness and places undue burdens on railroad workers, railroad pensioners, and the American taxpayer. Under the "consensus" package, the General Treasury would grant \$135 million to the railroad unemployment account. Additionally, the interest which should be paid on loans extended to the unemployment system by the railroad account would be forgiven. This would, in effect, be a grant to the railroad unemployment account at the expense of the railroad pensioners which could potentially cost the railroad retirement system almost \$3 billion.

Under the circumstances, for Congress to enact the proposal put forward by the rail industry would be most unwise. Congress has already acted twice to pull the railroad retirement account back from the brink of bankruptcy. While the financial situation of the retirement account appears to be much improved, it would be foolish to jeopardize the financial future of 1 million railroad pensioners by continuing to drain the fund to keep the unemployment system afloat.

The financial problems with the railroad unemployment system are the result of a serious underfunding of unemployment benefits by rail carriers. Railroad carriers only pay about \$30 a month per employee to fund the unemployment system. This is far below the contributions employers with employment records comparable to the rail carriers must pay under the Federal-State systems. The cost to employers under the State systems range from approximately \$53 to almost \$100 per month per employee.

If rail carriers are to retain an independent unemployment system, they should expect to pay for its full costs, including worker unemployment benefits comparable to the States' programs, all of the interest owed to the rail pension fund, and repayment of the principal within a reasonable term. Rail carriers should not expect subsidies from the American taxpayer, an acceptance of suppressed unemployment benefits by railroad workers, or the forgiveness of interest on the debt owed to the rail pensioners.

The legislation we are introducing today would establish a financially viable railroad unemployment insurance system that is fair to railroad workers and pensioners, the railroad carriers, and the American taxpayer. It retains the independent nature of the current system but makes two important changes.

First, it increases the maximum daily benefit afforded unemployed rail workers from its current, unrealistically low level of \$25 to \$35. The weight-

ed average of the maximum daily benefits provided unemployed workers in the six States with over 20,000 railroad workers is over \$40 or \$200 per week. Increasing the maximum daily benefit level to \$35 is an important step toward having railroad workers receive benefits comparable to what they would have received under the State-Federal system, and ensuring rail carriers pay the accurate costs of an independent unemployment insurance system.

Second, this bill increases the wage base for the unemployment tax from \$600 per month to \$1,300 per month, with a conforming increase in the wage base for the repayment tax which is scheduled to start in July 1986. Increasing the wage base from \$600 to \$1,300 should increase receipts sufficiently to pay for the increased benefits and the interest owed annually on the outstanding loan from the railroad retirement account, to repay the moneys owed the retirement account within the next 15 years, and to make the railroad unemployment insurance system solvent. This increase in receipts eliminates the need for the unemployment system to borrow from the railroad retirement account or any other fund.

The legislation we are introducing today places the full burden of supporting the railroad unemployment system on the rail carriers. At first glance, this may seem harsh, but this is exactly what occurs for every other business in America. In light of the successes of railroad deregulation, there is no reason to continue to shelter rail carriers and to expect railroad workers and retirees to continue to shoulder the burden of an independent rail unemployment insurance system. The tax increases contemplated by this legislation are large, but not excessive when compared with the taxes paid by other employers with comparable employment experience and the fact that the railroad unemployment insurance system has been chronically underfunded.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must act soon to develop a financially sound railroad unemployment system before the borrowing authority expires this fall. We invite our colleagues to join us in fashioning a solution that will be sensitive to all of the interests involved in this matter, particularly those of the railroad worker, railroad pensioner, and the American taxpayer. We urge our colleagues to study this issue and to become a cosponsor of this legislation. ●

## CABINET STATUS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

**HON. ANDY IRELAND**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, it seems everybody thinks small business is just wonderful. We have all heard the virtues of small business extolled again and again. Yet when it comes to a crucial decision and big business, big labor, and big government all weigh in on an issue, it is the interests of small business that lie crushed in the dust after all is said and done.

To survive and to be allowed to prosper in an appropriate economic environment, small business needs a strong voice that must be heard in every crucial discussion conducted within the Federal Bureaucracy. It seems to me after some reflection that a good permanent place to start is the Cabinet.

Recently, our present Cabinet was reorganized. The new Cabinet has no slot for the Small Business Administrator. For most of our recent history, this has been the rule rather than the exception. Today, I am introducing legislation which would correct this situation both for now and for the future.

My bill calls for the recognition of the Cabinet status of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. It will provide for the Administrator's full participation in the activities of this and all future Cabinets. It specifies that the Administrator will be the President's principal adviser on all matters relating to Small Business. Finally, it will make his pay status commensurate with Cabinet status.

This is "Small Business Week." I can think of no better time to get this permanent initiative underway. I welcome my colleagues' support on both sides of the aisle. ●

## CONDEMNING THE MURDER OF MAJOR NICHOLSON

**HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to explain why I voted against the unproductive and unprecedented amendment to the State Department authorization bill which called on the administration to expel from the United States the Soviet Chief of Missions unless the Soviet Union apologizes for the murder of Maj. Arthur Nicholson.

I was shocked and outraged by the brutal murder of Major Nicholson by a Soviet thug in East Germany. I was

even more infuriated that the Soviet authorities refused to allow Major Nicholson's driver to administer first aid that could well have saved the life of this bright young soldier. The death of Major Nicholson was nothing less than cold-blooded murder and it deserved condemnation.

On April 22, I joined with an overwhelming majority of my House colleagues in approving 394 to 2 House Resolution 125 condemning the Soviet Union for the murder of Major Nicholson. It was an appropriate action by the Congress and I wholeheartedly supported it.

The amendment considered today by the House, however, was totally inappropriate not because it expressed outrage over the tragic death of Major Nicholson, but because it flies in the face of our great Constitution.

Today's amendment disregarded the hallowed tenet of our Constitution which establishes a clear separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches. Congress has no right to intervene in what is clearly a diplomatic decision that rests with the President and the State Department.

I will support any resolution condemning the Soviet Union for this barbaric act of wanton murder, so long as the resolution is within the purview of the Congress.

But I will not vote for ill-considered resolutions or amendments that clearly violate the constitutional prerogatives of this body, regardless of the good intentions behind such a measure. I respect my colleagues' bona fide outrage over this tragic event, but I could not support the method they chose to display their anger.

Mr. Speaker, this was not an easy vote for me to cast. I strongly condemn the Soviet Union for this brutal slaying and I firmly believe the Soviets should issue an apology and compensate Major Nicholson's family, although nothing can truly compensate for the pain his grieving wife and child must feel.

I know I am going to have to spend many hours explaining my vote on this amendment and spelling out my reasons for not joining a majority of my colleagues in approving this amendment. But we in the House also must honor the rules and in this case we were dealing with a very important rule—the separation of powers among the three branches of our Federal Government.

I will continue to criticize and condemn the Soviets for this act of brutality, but I will do so in the proper forum.●

H.R. 2257

**HON. HAROLD E. FORD**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce today that I am sponsoring H.R. 2257, the Frequent Flyer Information Reporting Act. This legislation will require information reporting to the IRS for airline passes provided under frequent flyer or similar programs.

H.R. 2257 will require that any company which is in the business of providing transportation by air, and provides patronage passes to any customer shall file an information return, setting forth the name, address, and tax identification number of such customer and the aggregate value to such customer. The Secretary of the Treasury will prescribe the forms and regulations. Each company filing a return listing a customer shall furnish to each customer listed, a written statement forth the name of the company making the return and the aggregate value of the patronage passes provided to such customer as reported to the IRS. A patronage pass means any document which entitles the holder to a certain amount of air transportation at no charge or at a reduced charge, and which is provided to the customer on the basis of the customer's patronage.

The frequent flyer programs have been operating for the past 4 years and it is estimated that more than 7 million people are participating in at least one program. Today, virtually every major U.S. carrier has in place a marketing program based on free passes, ticket upgrades, including a variety of free goods and services from "tie-in" groups such as automobile rental companies, hotels as well as foreign airlines. These programs have millions of individuals as participants and they serve to exacerbate two serious problems facing the Nation's voluntary tax collection system.

These two problems are, first, the view of most taxpayers that businesses take advantage of loopholes and that the average taxpayer is therefore treated unfairly. Obviously the occasional air traveler cannot benefit from these programs and certainly all of the American who never fly should not be expected to subsidize those who do through the tax system. Second, taxpayers are concerned about the deficit and lost revenues. It is even a greater problem when the lost revenues are blatantly, even brazenly, bandied about and called effective marketing. Indeed, the absolute size of the lost revenue, while substantial, may not be as important as the message sent to millions of taxpayers.

We know that some travelers fly out of their way, in spite of increased cost to their companies, in order to get free passes. Some of those in the frequent flyer programs have qualified for more passes than they can use and are selling them for cash. Michael Boynton, manager of marketing programs for Delta Air Lines, reinforces the point regarding employees traveling out of their way to pick up bonus points by saying: "We've seen customers flying from New York to Los Angeles by way of Atlanta and Dallas even though our competitors offer nonstop flights at comparable rates."

It has been suggested that companies are paying a premium of 5 to 7 percent of their total travel budget as a result of these programs. Business spent \$66.5 billion on travel last year and the sums involved are large enough to merit the concern of Congress. While the Internal Revenue Service is aware of the lost revenue, this legislation will give the IRS congressional direction, so that additional revenues can be raised and the deficit reduced. The general manager of the American Society of Travel Agents, Robin Gray, has recognized that the personal use of frequent flyer coupons derived from business travel is taxable. It is not too much to ask the IRS to do the same and to give the IRS the tools to do so. I look forward to hearings and I encourage comments from major carriers, regional, and small carriers as well as those concerned with tax fairness and equity.●

**THE STATE OF FLORIDA AGAIN  
APPEALS TO CONGRESS TO  
DEAUTHORIZE THE CROSS-  
FLORIDA BARGE CANAL**

**HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida State Legislature yesterday once again appealed to Congress to finally deauthorize the long dormant cross-Florida barge canal project.

By a vote of 33-3, the Florida State Senate agreed to a statehouse bill urging Congress to take whatever steps necessary to complete the deauthorization process.

The State senate's action yesterday is particularly gratifying to this Member, because 24 years ago, as a member of that body, I first raised the issue of deauthorizing the cross-Florida barge canal when I offered an amendment to delete money for the project from the State budget. My amendment created a great furor in the legislature and was soundly defeated, but from that spark evolved a



statewide movement to deauthorize the barge canal.

Following my election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1971, one of my first items of business was to personally request that President Nixon stop funding construction of the barge canal. He agreed to my request, and as a result, work has been suspended for more than 14 years on this now obsolete project.

After many years of work in this regard, I was elated last year when the question to deauthorize the barge canal was finally placed before this body. Unfortunately, our amendment failed by just three votes. But, as I learned 24 years ago in the Florida State Senate, it is just a matter of time until we are successful in convincing a majority of our colleagues that the cross-Florida barge canal, first conceived more than 40 years ago, has outlived its usefulness.

Mr. Speaker, it's my hope that we will have the opportunity again this year to consider this issue so that we may once and for all fulfill the desire of an overwhelming majority of Florida's residents and deauthorize the cross-Florida barge canal.●

#### THE "JUSTICE" DEPARTMENT

#### HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 2, 1985, I received in my office a news release and information packet from E.F. Hutton & Co., Inc., regarding its pleading guilty in Federal court in Scranton, PA, to a U.S. Justice Department criminal information charge of 2,000 counts of mail and wire fraud in connection with a \$4.35 billion scheme from July 1980 to February 1982.

E.F. Hutton was fined the maximum \$1,000 on each charge of mail and wire fraud by the Federal judge, or a total of \$2 million, and was ordered to pay \$750,000 in court costs.

I ask my colleagues today what kind of justice is being doled out by our U.S. Justice Department? Certainly, Federal officials have explained that company employees have been granted immunity in order to push the investigation along. Another reason given for not prosecuting individuals who were participating in the bad check-writing incidents was that "it didn't seem fair to subsequently charge other individuals for doing identical acts."

I say it is another example of questionable justice when a deal is made to any company which has pleaded guilty to 2,000 felony counts of mail and wire fraud that has involved kiting checks worth more than a billion dollars to 400 American banks.

Recently the U.S. Justice Department indicted, convicted and sent to jail a Washington, DC, woman for "shoplifting four sweaters for a total value of not more than \$200."

Many Americans realize that the most politically conscious and active agency in our Federal Government is the U.S. Justice Department.●

#### STERLING HEIGHTS: A SAFE PLACE TO LIVE

#### HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend a hearty congratulation to a city in my district, Sterling Heights, for their efforts in combating crime. I would like to mention in particular the crime prevention division of the Sterling Heights police department which was recently named "outstanding unit" by the Crime Prevention Association of Michigan. This honor, incidentally, is an annual award given to members who have demonstrated an outstanding contribution to the citizens of Michigan in the field of crime prevention.

Prior to this recognition, Sterling Heights was named as one of the safest cities in the country. A large part of this achievement can be attributed to the work of the police department's crime prevention division which, together with the citizens of Sterling Heights, has worked on ways to prevent crime.

The community watch program which began a few years ago has been a highly successful anticrime venture between the city and the community. The low crime rate in Sterling Heights is due largely to the cooperation of the three faceted crime watch program. The first phase of the program is operation identification where residents engrave all valuable objects in the home. Second, is the neighborhood watch where residents make a concerted effort to familiarize themselves with their neighbors and learn to recognize suspicious individuals or actions. Third, city and local business employees are trained to recognize criminal activities so they can report any wrong doings they might encounter.

At this time, I would like to give special thanks to the mayor, members of the city council and the police officers who worked so hard to organize and successfully carry out this program: Chief Alan Nallepa, Sgt. Ken Ford—head of the crime prevention division—and officers Jack Sherby, Lee Hartson, Mike Rumps, and Andy Newcombe. Special praise also is in order for the block captains and neighbor-

hood volunteers who dedicate a great deal of time and energy to make this program work.

The best way to beat crime is through prevention. Under the direction of the crime prevention division, the residents, businesses and government employees in Sterling Heights have worked together to make their community a safer place to live.●

#### KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF VLADKA MEED TO THE INAUGURAL ASSEMBLY OF THE AMERICAN GATHERING OF JEWISH HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS

#### HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to all my colleagues the remarks of Vladka Meed in her keynote address to the Inaugural Assembly of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors. Her speech is a forceful and timely restatement of the horrors Jews suffered at the hands of Nazi Germany, and a reminder that now we all share the responsibility to see that such crimes never again occur. I insert her speech in the RECORD:

#### KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY VLADKA MEED

They wanted us to remember them.

In their last moments before death, they wrote it with their own blood, on walls—or carved it into the stones of the ghetto. "Remember us. Remember our lives. Remember our deaths."

And we, who survived, carry their memory within us wherever we go. We search for ways to inscribe it into the consciousness of our people and the world around us so that twisted minds of Nazi historians should not dishonor their memory.

I can still see the Warsaw Ghetto uprising before my eyes—the flames from burning Jewish houses, leaping over the ghetto walls and through the clouds of the thick smoke. I can still hear the sounds of explosions and the firing of Jewish guns. In its glare, I see the Jews of Warsaw, of Vilno, of Riga—of all the other ghettos. I see their life, their struggle, their resistance, during all the years of the Nazi occupation. I recall the crowded ghetto streets with hungry people, corpses laying unclaimed on the sidewalks; my neighbor standing in the doorway of our house to watch out for approaching Germans, while upstairs, her daughter held secret classes for children.

I recall the political groups of our idealistic youth—the Bundists, Zionists, Communists, religious groups—their illegal publications, the secret libraries, synagogues, yeshivas.

Yet, beyond the horrible suffering and terror, there was pulsating life in the ghettos—a life filled with meaning, with hope, with dignity.

This was resistance with a will to survive as a people and a spirit that refused to be crushed.

Then the final solution. . . .

I can still remember the thousands of Jews forced to line up in the narrow streets of the ghetto—and the German officer at the head of the line—pointing with a stick. "Left, right—left, right." I can still feel the dread as we stood in that line. Left—to the trains. Right—a few more days of survival in the ghetto. I still see them—our ghetto Jews—among them my dearest ones, walking on their last march to the trains—silent. As their footsteps echo in my mind, I can hear their unuttered outcry to God, and to a world that allowed all this to happen.

Yet, even then, many still nourished the hope against hope—that they would somehow survive. Even I, who knew, from my work in the underground, the actual destination of the trains—I could not believe when my mother and my brother were taken away—that they would be killed. I found myself hoping that maybe, after all, they had been sent—as the Germans claimed—to another city for resettlement.

How could our people, who for generations believed in human values, imagine such an utter madness as that of an enemy who planned our total annihilation? How could we grasp the scope of such a huge apparatus installed by German scientists—supported by trained military and civilian death squads with the cooperation and participation of its industry—of its people?

Yet, we, the survivors, are the witnesses—not only of murder and destruction, but also of the spirit of Jewish life under Nazism.

It is worthwhile to remember how inmates in the Estonian camp Narva, conducted illegal literary evenings. In Varvara Camp, Jews secretly observed Yom Kippur and organized minyans to say "Kadish" for those who perished. And even in the pit of hell in Auschwitz, surrounded by the smell of burning flesh, members of the Sonder Kommando, buried scripts next to the ovens, so if everyone perished, let the written word tell what happened to them.

While the world closed its eyes so as not to see the smoke of the crematoria, our people struggled to remain "menschen"—to preserve their beliefs in humanity—in God.

Those who view the Holocaust from a distance—often claim that organized Jewish resistance came too late. They would do well to remember that it came earlier than that of any other oppressed people in Europe. But the Jews—the most persecuted in the most hopeless position, were the first to revolt.

They were led by our youth. They were at the forefront of the Jewish struggle everywhere. The historic role of these idealistic young ghetto people has yet to be fully told.

It was my destiny to work with them—to see their determination—their spirit—their commitment and their dedication.

When I came on a mission with a small smuggled-in parcel of dynamite to one of the ghetto fighters' units—the young would approach me—their eyes burning with excitement—with interest. They would repeatedly ask me about our relations with the outside world. "When will we receive more arms? When will the Polish underground give us help? Hiding places for our ghetto children?"

And I would stand there, forlorn, unable to give them the answer they so desperately sought. Pitiful was the response from the Polish underground.

None of the young expected to survive a Nazi attack. Nor did they expect to influence in the smallest way the outcome of the war. But they were fueled by the conviction that their cause was just. The enemy must be fought. This is what drove them on.

I recall another Sunday in April, when the German soldiers marched in full gear, into the Warsaw Ghetto, to make it Judenrein.

Suddenly they came under fire. From buildings, from windows, from rooftops of houses, the Jews were shooting. The Germans withdrew. They set up artillery around the ghetto walls and from there, they systematically bombarded our positions. The ghetto did not yield. We were so poorly equipped—only a handful of grenades and revolvers and home-made Molotov Cocktail bottles against the combined might of the Wehrmacht. A gun against a tank. A revolver against a flame-thrower. One side street after another.

How can I forget the towers of flame? The smell—the stench of burning houses and the agonizing screams for help? And, in the midst of this flaming hell, the resistance went on—until the ghetto was charred rubble.

Those final days united them all. Those who had fallen with arms in hands—those who were gassed, and those who suffocated in the smoldering ruins—they were all united in one great chain of resistance against their enemy.

During the days of the uprising, the Jewish underground sent radio messages to the world—to our representatives in the Polish Government in exile stationed in London. We pleaded for ammunition. We begged for help. But, we were alone—abandoned.

Those of us who survived, can never forget the feeling of isolation and loneliness. History will never be able to explain our abandonment during those final hours.

Only one year later, I was in the uprising of Polish Warsaw. I remember at that time, the planes flying over the city, dropping arms and medical supplies to the Polish fighters; but when we fought, the skies over the ghetto were empty. In the months afterward, we learned of organized Jewish resistance in other ghettos and camps.

Today, we know that the world knew what was happening to us. London knew. Washington knew. The Vatican knew. And even the leaders of the Jewish community in the free world knew. As Hitler unleashed his murderous machine, systematically, and step by step, he always waited for an outcry of world opinion, but such an outcry never came. The world paid attention only to the military battle—and not to the war against the Jews. Thus, Auschwitz was not bombed. The gates of America and Palestine were kept closed and few spoke out, until it was too late.

Now, as world leaders gather to celebrate the end of World War II, we the survivors of the war against the Jews, think not only of military valor and of victory—but we think of our Jewish world that was cut down—of Jewish suffering and resistance. Yes, we will remember, with gratitude and respect, the decency of the few—of some righteous people and nations. And we will remember, above all, the moral meaning of that victory and its implication for our future.

The world is now eager to forget our tragic past—to pretend it never happened.

However, we know that the world is not free of the horror, of the poison which bore Auschwitz and Teblinka. Even today, Israel stands threatened. Soviet Jewry remain oppressed, and even in many free countries—Neo-Nazis try to poison the air with their hatred and lies.

For us, the news of today constantly evokes echoes of the past:

The Austrian Defense Minister greeting a freed Nazi war criminal as if he were a re-

turning dignitary, rather than a mass murderer.

The Toronto trial, where the question as to whether the Holocaust actually existed was to be decided by a court.

The gathering of the Allies will mark the end of World War II—and to avoid a possible offense to Germany, President Reagan did not intend to visit the death camps and pay tribute to our Jewish martyrs in Dachau. But at the same time, a visit is planned by him to a German military cemetery where Nazi murderers are buried. Shocked and bewildered, we asked in dismay: Is not Dachau liberated 40 years ago by American troops, the place of symbolic historic significance? To be remembered and honored by our President?

The leaders of the World do not wish to be reminded of the past. But the past remains a constant warning of the challenges of survival that lie ahead. And what has seen us through history and will also see us through the future, are the indestructible bonds created by the suffering, remembrance and hope by all of those who cherish freedom.

And we, who survive, shall continue to tell and retell the story of a people who refused to yield—the story of a people who would never say that they were marching on their last road.

[Vladka Meed, author of "On Both Sides of the Wall," chairwoman, Cultural Commission.]

#### UNITED STATES-ISRAEL FREE TRADE AGREEMENT BENEFITS BOTH NATIONS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the economy of Israel is currently facing serious problems, but the Israeli Government is making the difficult choices that are necessary to restore its economic health. Emergency assistance, which I am certain Congress will approve later this year, will provide interim help.

In the long term, however, Israel needs two things to maintain its economic viability. First, it needs peace; second, it needs access to larger markets. While we are all hopeful that the United States will play a constructive role in bringing an end to hostilities in that troubled region, access to larger markets is an important element that the United States can provide now.

Mr. Speaker, in a historic step on April 22, representatives of the United States and Israel signed the United States-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement—the first free trade area agreement ever entered into by the United States. The Congress has just approved the legislation necessary to implement that agreement.

While this free trade agreement is an important first step, it will not provide an immediate fix for the Israeli economy, since the agreement's provi-



sions will be phased-in gradually over the next 10 years. In the long run, however, it will be vitally important. Israeli manufacturers can now think in terms of serving a market of 237 million people—60 times the size of that of Israel. Efficiencies that result from large-scale production, that could not be considered for the Israeli market alone, are now possible. Specialization in technologies and products that are important for the American market can now be expanded by innovative Israeli entrepreneurs.

The Israeli leaders have made a tough decision by deciding to enter into this free trade agreement, but they have made the right decision. For the first time, Israeli companies will have to compete head on with American companies. The Israeli economy has been protected from American competition by high tariff barriers, and subsidy programs have shielded the Israelis from direct competition.

Important changes will take place in the Israeli economy as it adjusts to competition with American firms. Israeli firms will become more efficient as they face American competition. I am confident that they will meet the challenge that the free trade agreement will bring.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to emphasize that this is not a one-sided agreement. There are significant economic benefits for the United States. The European Economic Community, which next to Japan is our second most important trade competitor, already has a free trade arrangement with Israel that has been in effect for over a decade. Our agreement will put American exporters on an equal footing with their European competitors in the Israeli market.

Furthermore, about 90 percent of Israeli exports to the United States are already duty free, whereas our duty-free exports to Israel constitute only about 35 to 40 percent. Thus, new opportunities will become available for American exporters. While Israel will benefit from this agreement, it is also clear that the United States has as much to gain.

The free trade agreement, by removing trade barriers, will strengthen the economic relations between the United States and our strategic and stable ally in the Middle East. Strengthening our economic ties will contribute to the important political and strategic relationship we share. It will make for a stronger and more prosperous Israel and United States.●

## MATT AND ROSE LAMB

## HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, recently two outstanding citizens in the Third Congressional District were honored by being invested as Papal Knight and Lady of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem. Mr. Matt Lamb and his wife Rose, among the 100 men and women from 14 Midwestern States to be invested, were named by the Holy Father Pope John Paul II, "from among persons of a deep and practical Catholic faith and of unblemished moral conduct."

Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, himself a Papal Knight, presided at the April 28 ceremony and Archbishop Michael McAuliffe, Grand Prior of the Knights, invested the Knights and Ladies.

The order is the oldest existing Order of Knighthood in the world. Serving 25 countries today, it stems from the first Crusade when knights were made guards of honor for the Holy Sepulchre—the partially restored basilica on the site of Jesus' tomb—by Pope Pascal II in 1113. The purpose of the order today is to "revive in a modern manner the spirit and ideal of the Crusades."

Practical work of the order has included creation, support, and maintenance of an educational system for the Christian minority in the Holy Land. In 1981, a school for youngsters of the Christian faith was built in Beit Sahour and the University of Bethlehem for Christians was established. The order also supports medical facilities, orphanages, and homes for the aged in the Holy Land. A modern institution for the care of congenital deaf-mutism, a common disorder in the Middle East, has been developed near Bethlehem by the order.

It has been my privilege to know Matt and Rose Lamb for many years and I am not surprised at their being chosen for this high honor—a reflection of the involvement and compassion and concern they bring to people and to their community. Such people can remind us of what is good within us, and inspire us to live a life that reflects enduring values and faith. I know my colleagues join with me in commending them for their fine work and for this singular honor.●

## CARGO PREFERENCE

## HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 of this year, the National Commission on Agricultural Trade and Export Policy issued its first report to the President and Congress regarding U.S. agricultural export policy. The Commission is comprised of 32 members—a majority and minority member from each of the agriculture, foreign affairs, and tax-writing committees of both Houses of Congress and 20 members from the private sector who represent interests that are involved in either the production, processing or exportation of agricultural commodities. The purpose of the Commission is to review past and current U.S. policies that affect agricultural exports and make policy recommendations to the administration and Congress that will encourage the growth of foreign agricultural sales and markets.

As a member of the Commission, I would like to share with my colleagues the section of the March 31 report pertaining to cargo preference. It was a unanimous decision by all of the private sector members of the Commission and by most of the congressional Members that the export of agricultural commodities, including the shipments of food aid under the Public Law 480 program, should be exempt from cargo preference requirements.

As the following excerpt from the Commission's report illustrates, the bulk of the cargo preference subsidies are received by a handful of U.S. maritime shipping companies. It is worth noting that the top 16 maritime recipients of cargo preference subsidies received a total of 59,623,499 in cargo preference freight differentials for shipment of food aid under titles I and III of Public Law 480 because of cargo preference requirements.

I submit for my colleagues the complete text of that section of the Commission's report which relates to cargo preference. I would urge my colleagues that Congress act now to exempt from cargo preference requirements not only the USDA's blended credit programs, but also the shipment of Public Law 480 food aid.

## CARGO PREFERENCE SECTION

(First Report (March 31, 1985) National Commission on Agricultural Trade and Export Policy)

## POLICY STATEMENT

The Commission strongly opposes the concept of cargo preference as currently applied to food aid programs and, potentially, to other programs designed to expand sales of U.S. products.

The Commission recognizes that other interests may be served by cargo preference, but has seen little evidence that the objec-

tives of the program are being met. While the Commission does not take issue with the need for maintaining a strong U.S. maritime industry, it does not believe that cargo preference applied to exports of U.S. farm products is the appropriate means to achieve this objective. The Commission believes that U.S. agriculture would lend its support to the maritime industry to strengthen the industry if cargo preference requirements on agricultural products were eliminated. However, cargo preference is not supported by the U.S. agricultural community. The method of financing the program should not be by appropriation to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Appropriations to carry out the program should be provided by Congress directly to the Maritime Administration. The Commission encourages the U.S. maritime industry to cooperate with agricultural interests toward a goal of greater viability for both industries, as a first step, through exempting agricultural exports from existing cargo preference requirements.

## RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission recommends that Congress immediately enact legislation to exempt all agricultural exports and export programs from existing cargo preference requirements.

2. Congress should direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to reflect subsidy payments deemed necessary to support the maritime industry in the appropriate function of the Federal budget, other than Functions 150 or 350. Appropriations to carry out assistance to the maritime industry should be provided by Congress directly to the Maritime Administration.

## COMMENTARY

Cargo preference requirements result in Federal government outlays incurred by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). The USDA budget, already facing criticism as a result of the exceptionally heavy cost of farm programs, should not have to bear the cost of ocean freight differentials required to ship agricultural commodities and products on U.S. vessels.

A major share of the cost of cargo preference results from exports under U.S. food aid programs. In the thirty years since the enactment of P.L. 480, the total cost of cargo preference has been more than \$1 billion. Currently, costs are running around \$75 million annually and are expected to exceed \$100 million in 1985.

Costs associated with cargo preference in the Title II program generally are lower than those incurred under Title I because the volume of commodities is lower and there is less use of bulk carriers. In 1984, \$20.2 million was spent on ocean freight differentials under that Title II program. This included \$1.3 million for processed grain products, \$0.8 million for bagged grain and \$18.1 million for bulk commodities.

## PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE I/III, EXPENDITURES

(In million of dollars)

	Com- modities	Ocean freight differen- tial	Total
1977	723.1	75.5	798.6
1978	67.1	62.6	733.7
1979	754.5	122.5	827.0
1980	845.8	63.0	908.8
1981	781.3	65.1	846.4
1982	712.0	120.1	832.1

## PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE I/III, EXPENDITURES—Continued

(In million of dollars)

	Com- modities	Ocean freight differen- tial	Total
1983	766.0	77.2	843.2
1984 (estimate)	781.0	69.5	850.5
1985 (estimate)	997.0	109.0	1,106.0
1986 (estimate)	921.5	108.5	1,030.0

The subsidized flour sale to Egypt in early 1983 was subject to cargo preference because the price of the flour was reduced to meet the EC level of prices of approximately \$160 per metric ton. Since a subsidy was involved, cargo preference was applicable. The sale was made using Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of wheat. U.S. flour millers placed bids on wheat stocks from CCC holdings as to the volume of "free" wheat needed in order to sell the flour to Egypt at a reduced price. Since the flour mills were aware that the cost of shipping to Egypt would be increased by the requirement that half the flour go on U.S. bottoms, they increased the volume of wheat needed. ASCS estimates that an additional 6 million bushels of U.S. wheat from CCC stocks were used to offset the increased cost of U.S. bottoms. Based on prices at the time, the estimated cost to CCC was \$24 million.

In late February 1985, a court ruling was handed down that cargo preference laws were applicable to the blended credit program. Blended credit is a mixture of direct Government loans and credit guarantees to banks. Under the program, the blend was generally 20 percent direct credit at zero interest rate and 80 percent of guarantees at the prevailing commercial interest rate. The direct credit portion was ruled by the courts to constitute a subsidy and, therefore, cargo preference laws were applicable. This means, of course, that 50 percent of the shipments under blended credit must be in U.S. bottoms at rates \$20 to \$50 per ton above non-U.S. flag carrier rates. (Only wheat sales to North Africa and a small wheat flour sale to Iraq were programmed under the blended credit program.) Cargo preference would add between 8 percent and 15 percent to the cost of a ton of wheat (approximately \$150). The 20 percent interest subsidy will hardly offset the 8-15 percent increase in the landed price of the commodity. In this instance, cargo preference effectively kills a successful effort to combat unfair EC trade practices and reduces the export volume for U.S. wheat farmers.

According to USDA, companies that received payments in 1984 for ocean freight differentials under Titles I and III of P.L. 480 are:

Company:	Payments
Lykes Steamship Co., Inc.....	\$9,356,765
Ultimar Shipping Co., Inc.....	8,934,407
Central Gulf Lines, Inc.....	7,561,504
Phoenix Bulkship, Inc.....	7,395,741
American President Lines, Inc.....	5,311,396
Equity Carriers III, Inc.....	2,863,950
Waterman Steamship Co.....	2,781,852
Delta Steamship Lines, Inc....	2,633,032
Apex Marine Corporation.....	2,449,000
A.P. St. Philip, Inc.....	1,981,650
Asco-Falcon II Shipping, Inc.	1,650,949
Ogden Missouri Transport Inc.....	1,587,832
Archon Marine Co.....	1,434,160
Universal American Barge Corp.....	1,298,500

Ocean Barge Corp.....	1,267,537
Transbulk Carriers, Inc.....	1,115,224

A total of 14 other companies received payments for ocean freight differential in 1984 for shipments under P.L. 480, with amounts ranging from \$13,869 up to \$852,066.

# TRIBUTE TO THE HONTERUS EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH OF YOUNGSTOWN, OH

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 of this year, the Honterus Evangelical Church of Youngstown, OH, will be celebrating its 75th anniversary. At this time, I would like to pay tribute to this church and its congregation, and congratulate them for reaching this significant milestone.

Mr. Speaker, the congregation of Honterus Evangelical Lutheran Church consists of American citizens of German heritage who trace their family origins back to Transylvania, in the Carpathian mountains of Europe. Many of them came here at the turn of the century to flee persecution and oppression. They brought with them a thirst for freedom and they have added significantly to the rich immigrant heritage of this country.

The membership of the Honterus Evangelical Lutheran Church has made significant contributions to the Mahoning Valley area over the past 75 years and has been a vibrant part of the community in my home district. They have always reached out and joined with the community in times of need and have run many programs for youth, seniors, and the less fortunate.

The accomplishments and contributions of the congregation of Honterus are a rich example of the diverse ethnic quality of America. They symbolize the greatness of this Nation and its source of strength: Hard-working people who came to this country with a dream and desire for freedom. Through dedication, unbending faith, and laborious effort, they helped build the world's strongest democracy. The longevity and vitality of the Honterus Evangelical Lutheran Church is not only symbolic of the dedication and faith of its membership, it is also reflective of the enormous pride and spirit of this nation of immigrants.

I am proud to pay tribute to the congregation of Honterus and it gives me great pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to them on the occasion of their 75th anniversary.●



**BOB BARROS: A FRIEND FOR  
ALL SEASONS**

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● **Mr. KEMP.** Mr. Speaker, when Bob Barros retires as headmaster of Mater Dei this year, an era will come to an end. Bob founded Mater Dei 25 years ago, and today it stands as a fine example of the excellence that can be achieved in the field of education and training for our youth. His absence will be deeply felt by all those whose lives have been touched by Mater Dei—most especially the young people who have learned so much under his tutelage and leadership.

Bob is a man of integrity and dedication. I am proud to say that he has been a real friend to our family for many years. We wish Bob, Carol Ann, and his lovely family all the best in the years to come, and I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues as a tribute to a friend for all seasons.

On behalf of all the parents whose children's lives have been touched in one way or another by Mater Dei and Bob Barros, this article is submitted.

**BOB BARROS—HEADMASTER**

**MATER DEI FOUNDER RETIRES AFTER 25 YEARS;  
SCHOOL GREW FROM HUMBLE BEGINNINGS AND  
FAITH**

(By Judith Scioli)

On the eve of Bob Barros' retirement as headmaster of Mater Dei, the school for boys he founded 25 years ago, memories are stirring. Some reach back to the school's humble beginnings as a yet-to-be refurbished barn in Silver Spring.

"Picture it," Barros marvels as if glancing backward at his own daring. "I was interviewing the families of prospective students in one of the rooms where they put the mare on one side and the stallion on the other! Those parents had to be courageous!"

"I remember it well," laughs Louis Boland, one of those "courageous" parents. "Bob took us into the classrooms. They had earthen floors and the heat was questionable. But I had confidence in the man. As my wife and I left, I turned to her and commented, 'Well, I always said education wasn't just brick and mortar.'"

Eventually, the brick and mortar came too. But even with the school's move to its serene campus off Seven Locks Road, there has never been any doubt among parents that Bob Barros was offering something to their children more solid than a building. He was offering himself. And that has not made his retirement easy to accept.

For Bill McMurtrie, president of the school's board of trustees last year when Barros made his decision to leave, it was particularly difficult. A close friend, McMurtrie considers Barros' stewardship of Mater Dei unparalleled and was heartsick at the thought of his leaving. Yet, because of his position on the board, it fell to him to prepare the letter accepting Barros' resignation.

"Make it short," requested Barros. "One page."

Some days later, Barros asked for the letter. McMurtrie hedged but finally produced it. He admitted it did not exactly fit Barros' specification. Instead of the brief reply suggested, McMurtrie had written two full pages.

"Bob, I just can't condense it," said McMurtrie, handing over the letter.

"Sure you can," responded Barros and sat down to read it. Some moments later, Barros looked up from the two pages of eloquent prose full of heartfelt admiration of Barros. Suppressing a schoolboy grin, the headmaster sighed, "You know you're right, Bill. There's not a single thing you can cut out!"

The anecdote is telling. His peers—many of whom are themselves highly placed and highly regarded—find Barros worthy of the highest praise for his work in the most serious of fields—the education of their sons. Barros accepts that praise not as his due, but with the kind of humor that alone makes exceptional people accessible to the rest of us.

Barros started Mater Dei in 1960. He was a former marine captain with six years teaching experience and, rumor has it, \$300 in his pocket. But he was ready to strike out on his own.

"It was a time that happened to coincide with a period of my life when I was getting a little closer to my faith," said Barros, who felt disturbed that the youngsters he was teaching were "growing up with nothing."

His own religious revival and the conviction that religion should play a role in education combined to draw him quite naturally into Catholic education, and he sought permission from the archdiocese to open a school.

His wife, Carol Ann, found the old farm in Silver Spring which became the first site of Mater Dei. Barros opened with four teachers and 37 youngsters in grades one through six. A few years later, at about the time of the move to the Seven Locks location, Barros extended the school through grade eight.

"I gave the school 10 years to see if it were going to float or not, and after 10 years, I knew we had something going," said Barros, patient, it seems, even in his lean days.

Once Mater Dei hit the decade mark, progress went swiftly. In 1970, Barros established the board of advisors, which incorporated and became the board of trustees. Their first act was to build a gymnasium, which the school paid for in a year and a half.

According to Barros, a school's success can be measured in a number of ways. From the purely practical standpoint, he notes, enrollment is a good yardstick. "You either have a full school or you don't. If you have a full school, the community is giving you a message," he said, "particularly when you don't advertise. It's all word of mouth."

From a business standpoint, adds Barros, the bills have to be paid. "You certainly have to show that you're a viable business proposition, at least if you're privately owned," he said.

"And then there is the intangible: If more people are telling you you're doing a good job than there are whispers that you're doing a bad job, then you assume you're doing something right!" he declared.

Barros attributes the success of Mater Dei to the selection process for students, the quality and calibre of teachers, and an atmosphere where teachers are free to teach.

"To the extent that we can, we are selective in the kind of youngsters who are invit-

ed to attend the school," said Barros. "In that selectivity, we are taking youngsters whose parents want for their children what we are providing. In different schools that can be different things," he said.

He added that the selection process does not mean that the school is looking for so-called "gifted" students. "I think there's a misconception that private schools cater only to the brightest. The truth is, we cater to the community at large. And there are more average kids who, if made to work, do well, than there are gifted kids. Every school, public or private, has its share of gifted kids. But no school can cater just to them," he explained.

As for selecting teachers, Barros is forthright in what he expects. "I have always been a big believer that if a youngster has to sit in front of somebody for five to six hours a day, that person ought to be attractive and vibrant," insists Barros.

Perhaps no one is more cognizant for Barros' ability to attract and keep an exceptional faculty than attorney Edward Bennett Williams. Williams sent his sons to Mater Dei and served on the board of trustees for several years. "My boys all had a great fondness for the place," he commented. "One of them, in fact, had such great affection for the school and for Bob that he is now teaching there."

Williams attributes much of Mater Dei's success to its staff and to Barros' appeal as a role model.

And indeed, impeccably dressed and handsome, Barros is a man who invites the respect of students and the confidence of mothers.

He is a man who learns the names of each first grader because he thinks that when a child says, "Hi, Mr. Barros," he deserves a hello back using that little boy's name.

He is a man who reminds his faculty each September that when a teacher is talking to a parent about his child, he is talking about the only thing in the world that really makes a difference to him.

At the same time, he is a man who is not hesitant to draw a line between what he considers parental "interest" and parental "intrusiveness." He has strong views on "letting teachers teach" and doesn't tolerate parents treading on his faculty turf.

"He's first class," said attorney Joseph Califano, who sent his two sons to Mater Dei and served on the board with Williams. "I think he has run the most superb school for young men in the area."

For all the praises heaped upon him, Barros does not consider himself indispensable to the future of Mater Dei. On the contrary, he is confident that the school will do well, and he intends to stay out of the way of the new headmaster, Christopher Abell, a man who Barros says, has served "with distinction" on the faculty for years.

Barros believes the school will stay as it is, with modifications that will be "evolutionary, not dramatic."

Nor does he anticipate a change in the students. Barros sees little difference between the youngsters of a quarter of a century ago and those of today.

"I think the most profound change that I have seen in 25 years has come over me and not the children. I think the children are pretty much today the way they always were," mused Barros. "But when I was younger, I had all the answers for all of the children and all of their problems. Twenty-five years later, I have very few of the answers, more questions, and perhaps a little more sensitivity that problems are more

complicated than they seem on the surface."

Barros will continue to run Mater Dei's summer camp program and to serve on the board of trustees of both Georgetown Prep and Worcester State College in Massachusetts.

He also intends to "learn to love to play golf," to take courses at the Smithsonian, and to spend time at his summer house of Kent Island on the Eastern Shore. He and his wife, Carol Ann, have four children: Mariesa, who works in Georgetown; Carla, a sophomore at the University of Notre Dame; Stephen, a junior at Gonzaga; and Mike, a junior at Georgetown Prep.

He is retiring as headmaster of Mater Dei—what he calls, "the best job in the world"—with no regrets. In his own words, "There comes a time for even the 'best' to come to an end and June of '85 will mark 25 years—it has a nice ring to it." ●

#### THE U.S. ACADEMIC DECATHLON ASSOCIATION

### HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, academic excellence is alive and thriving in America, thanks to the dedication of hundreds of volunteer teachers and professionals who have organized the U.S. Academic Decathlon Association. Together with financial supporters from business, community organizations, and concerned individuals, these volunteers have reached into public and private high schools to encourage students to compete in an effort to raise their level of intellectual pursuit.

The academic decathlon promotes thinking in an age of instant gratification. Technological advancement, over specialization, and abbreviated communications processes have forced policy and decisionmakers to concentrate on short-term answers to escalating problems. In assessing needs in society, educators have devised a program to motivate students intellectually and to develop their mental discipline in order to prepare our young people for the rigors of solving society's complex problems.

The academic decathlon is a competition involving 10 events in economics, language and literature, fine arts, mathematics, science, social science, and super quiz—a team event held before an audience. In addition, each student is required to write an essay, to deliver a prepared and an impromptu speech, and to undergo an oral interview. Based on the accumulated points of the individual schools, each State sends its winner to the national competition.

The 1985 Arizona Academic Decathlon is the first year the competition involved students from throughout the State. The winner of the State competition, Chaparral High School from Scottsdale, AZ, went on to place 10th

overall in the national competition in Los Angeles this April and won the national super quiz. I join with the parents, teachers, and friends of these students to congratulate them on their victory. I hope the medals and plaques that serve as tangible reminders of their efforts will also remind the Chaparral Academic Decathlon Team of their responsibilities to their peers. They have opened doors for students who will follow them and who will work that much harder to represent Arizona next year.

The runners-up in the State competition—from Saguro and university high schools in Tucson—and the students at Douglas High, Florence High, and the other schools who participated for the first time, also share the responsibility for continuing the academic excellence embodied in the decathlon. They will carry with them throughout their lives the knowledge and mental discipline to serve society as leaders and to challenge their fellow citizens.

I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in applauding the work of all those associated with the U.S. Academic Decathlon Association. I would like to add my thanks to Anita Lohr, Pima County school superintendent and the Arizona Department of Education, for their faith in the intellectual abilities of Arizona's young people and their commitment to academic excellence. ●

#### HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ZEROS 30 DEFENSE PROGRAMS

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1985

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Committee has cut \$18.9 billion and terminated 30 procurement programs from the administration's defense budget for fiscal year 1986. Let me present here some details of our work on the bill.

I believe this is the largest number of procurement programs ever terminated in the committee's history. The actions cut almost \$2 billion.

Overall, the reduced budget provides no real growth—and a real cut of more than 2 percent in weapons procurement.

This budget is but one step down the road we must travel to tighten up the military budget. We eliminated many systems here. A lot of them are very small programs that no one has heard of, but that's the best time to stop a program. In other cases, we have killed a program for this year, but indicated we may be willing to fund it in the future.

Our intentions here are clear:

We want more defense, not more production lines.

We seek to fund military requirements, not bureaucratic wish lists.

Our goal is to increase the level of deterrence, not the number of contracts.

The President's budget request represented a real increase for defense—that is, an increase over and above inflation—of about 6 percent. The committee's actions would trim the real growth rate down to zero—that is, provide the same level of funds as in fiscal year 1985 plus an amount necessary to cover inflation in the intervening months.

In making its reduction, the committee made a conscious effort to protect the personnel and operations accounts by taking the bulk of the cuts from the investment accounts—procurement and R&D.

I would like to quote the ranking Republican member of the committee, Representative WILLIAM L. DICKINSON. He has said.

With the huge Federal deficit staring us in the face, we cannot afford to buy all the systems the Pentagon wants. A weapon that may sound very reasonable when you're running a surplus does not necessarily sound so reasonable when you're running a deficit. In other words, we have tried to set some priorities. We have funded necessities, not nice-to-haves.

Targets set in the annual budget resolutions apply to appropriations bills, but not to authorization bills. It has, however, been the policy of the House Armed Services Committee in past years to be consistent with the budget resolution. No budget resolution has yet been passed or reported out by the House Budget Committee, so the House Armed Services Committee chose the zero real growth mark itself.

The committee voted to approve the reduced bill on a vote of 39 to 7. The nay votes were cast by—Democrats: RONALD V. DELLUMS of California, PATRICIA SCHROEDER of Colorado, and DENNIS M. HERTEL of Michigan; and Republicans: BOB STUMP of Arizona, JIM COURTER of New Jersey, LARRY J. HOPKINS of Kentucky, and WILLIAM CARNEY of New York.

Table 1 provides a summary and budget track for the entire national defense function of the budget—function 050—for fiscal year 1986.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET TRACK, FUNCTION 050, FISCAL YEAR 1986—BUDGET AUTHORITY

(In billions of dollars)				
	Requested	Authorized	Change	Percent Cut
1. Defense Authorization Act.....	230.5	216.2	-14.3	-6.2
2. Unauthorized personnel.....	73.4	69.1	-4.3	-5.9
3. Military construction.....	10.3	9.6	-0.7	-6.9
4. DOE—Military.....	8.0	7.7	-0.3	-3.0
5. Selective Service and other.....	.1			
Total.....	322.2	302.6	-19.6	-6.1



Line 1 is the Defense Authorization Act, which is described in this report.

Line 2 is military personnel. Congress does not authorize dollar figures for military pay and other personnel provisions. The House Armed Services Committee implicitly controls the dollar figures, however, by authorizing the size of the services and the annual pay raise. Line 2 reflects the dollar impact of the committee's personnel actions. This report uses the dollar figures explicitly although they do not appear in the bill itself. The dollar figures are used in the appropriations bill, accounting for the huge difference between the two bills.

Line 3 covers military construction, which is a separate bill. The committee has not yet approved this bill. The reduction indicated in table 1 is the target the committee has set. The figure in the first paragraph of a reduction of \$18.5 billion does not include any reductions in military construction since the bill has not been reported.

Line 4 is the national security programs contained in the Department of Energy budget—primarily nuclear warhead and atomic reactor programs. This has normally been a separate bill. This year it is appended to the Defense Authorization Act. The committee action is described at the end of this report.

Line 5 covers miscellaneous programs such as the Selective Service System that have minor budgetary impact.

The committee spent 9 hours marking up the bill Tuesday and Wednesday, considering 43 amendments to the drafts submitted by its subcommittees. The scale of the work was extensive; for example, the committee made changes to 266 lines in the procurement section and 249 requests in the R&D section of the administration request.

The major actions taken by the committee included:

#### MX MISSILE

On a rollcall vote of 13 to 32, the committee defeated an amendment to cap deployment of the MX at 40. On a voice vote, the committee defeated an amendment to delete all procurement money, which would have the effect of capping deployment at 33. The committee cut the administration's quantity request from 48 to 21 and its budget request from \$3.2 billion to \$2.1 billion for procurement.

#### CHEMICAL WEAPONS

The committee defeated on a voice vote an amendment to delete all funds for building binary chemical weapons. The committee approved the procurement request of \$124.5 million.

#### STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

The administration requested \$3.7 billion for SDI. The committee took the following four votes on the funding level:

Motion of: Representative JAMES COURTER, of New Jersey; \$3.1 billion; defeated 11 to 35. Representative RONALD V. DELLUMS, of California; \$0.9 billion; defeated on voice vote. Representative NICHOLAS MAVROULES, of Massachusetts, and Representative DENNIS HERTEL, of Michigan; \$1.4 billion; defeated 6 to 40. R&D Subcommittee recommendation; \$2.5 billion; approved on voice vote.

#### MILITARY RETIREMENT

The committee deleted \$4 billion from the funds requested for military pay and pensions in order to force the Defense Department to draft a new retirement program. The committee grandfathered everyone currently in uniform or retired. In other words, the program of reduced retirement benefits will apply only to those persons entering the Armed Forces after the date of enactment of the changes.

#### AMRAAM

The principal weapon system killed by the committee was the joint Air force/Navy advanced medium-range air-to-air missile [AMRAAM], which was designed as a follow-on missile to the Sparrow. The committee felt that projected costs had risen more than excessively, warranting termination. While the Defense Department had requested authorization to buy the first 90 of the missiles in fiscal year 1986, it was estimated AMRAAM would still require another half-billion dollars to complete R&D. The committee estimated that unit costs for the AMRAAM could end up at triple the original projected cost. Additionally the program schedule has slipped by almost 2 years.

Table 2 summarizes the committee's action for both procurement and research and development on the 25 largest weapons programs in the budget request. These 25 programs represent 24 percent of everything requested for RDT&E, and 38 percent of everything requested for procurement. The programs are listed in order of the size of their total R&D and procurement request.

At \$6 billion, the B-1 bomber is by far the largest program, consuming 2 percent of the entire defense budget. This year's request for 48 aircraft completes the planned buy of 100. No request was made—and no authorization was provided—to buy the long-lead parts that would be required in fiscal year 1986 in order to procure more B-1's in fiscal year 1987.

The second largest program, the MX, was discussed earlier. The third largest program is the Air Force's F-16 Falcon. The committee reduced the order from 180 to 150 to keep production steady at the same level as fiscal year 1985.

TABLE 2.—25 MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS IN FY 86 BUDGET—LISTED IN ORDER OF SIZE OF REQUEST

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1986 request			HASC			Change		
	R&D	Quantity	Procurement	R&D	Quantity	Procurement	R&D	Quantity	Procurement
B-1 bomber	367.4	48	5,624.0	200.0	48	5,624.0	-167.4	NC	NC
MX missile	784.0	48	3,180.2	684.0	21	2,117.8	-100.0	-27	-1,062.4
F-16 Falcon	94.9	180	3,693.4	84.0	150	3,050.7	-10.9	30	-642.7
SDI	3,722.2	NR	NR	2,473.0	NR	NR	-1,249.2	NR	NR
F/A-18 Hornet	58.3	84	2,849.7	30.0	84	2,743.0	-28.3	NC	-106.5
Trident II missile D5	2,156.2	NR	582.0	2,100.0	NR	572.0	-56.2	NR	-10.0
CG-47 Aegis	48.5	3	2,834.8	48.5	3	2,834.8	NC	NC	NC
SSN-668 attack sub	NR	4	2,770.3	NR	4	2,770.3	NR	NC	NC
F-15 Eagle	252.1	48	2,224.4	252.2	42	1,918.1	NC	-6	-306.3
C-5B Galaxy	NR	16	2,380.6	NR	16	2,278.6	NR	NC	-102.0
M-1 Abrams tank	24.8	840	2,204.3	39.9	840	2,126.4	+15.1	NC	-77.9
Trident submarine	56.6	1	1,546.4	56.6	1	1,546.4	NC	NC	NC
LHD-1 amphibious ship	6.0	1	1,507.2	6.0	1	1,314.2	NC	NC	-193.0
AH-64	17.5	144	1,376.3	17.5	144	1,376.3	NC	NC	NC
Patriot missile	53.1	585	1,088.4	53.1	585	1,088.4	NC	NC	NC
F-14 Tomcat	348.1	18	812.4	348.1	18	712.4	NC	NC	-100.0
AV-8B Harrier	72.1	46	1,076.6	72.1	46	1,031.6	NC	NC	-45.0
Bradley fighting vehicle	2.2	716	1,065.1	2.2	716	1,065.1	NC	NC	NC
Standard missile	47.2	1,316	874.1	60.0	1,241	802.6	+12.8	-75	-71.5
Tomahawk missile	68.8	249	780.0	43.0	249	780.0	-25.8	NC	NC
KC-135 reengining	1.0	43	727.4	1.0	43	727.4	NC	NC	NC
Midjetman	624.5	NR	NR	624.5	NR	NR	NC	NR	NR
GLCM	.7	95	555.2	.7	95	545.2	NC	NC	-10.0
JVX	608.6	NR	NR	553.7	NR	NR	-59.9	NR	NR
MLRS	NR	72,000	569.4	NR	72,000	569.4	NR	NC	NC

TABLE 2.—25 MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS IN FY 86 BUDGET—LISTED IN ORDER OF SIZE OF REQUEST—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1986 request			HASC			Change		
	R&D	Quantity	Procurement	R&D	Quantity	Procurement	R&D	Quantity	Procurement
Total.....	9,414.8		40,322.2						

Note.—NC=No charge; NR=No request.

Table 3 summarizes the action taken by the committee on the Defense authorization bill. It is a breakdown of the first two lines of table 1—which outlines the entire national defense function 050. Actions of the Senate Armed Services Committee [SASC] are shown for comparison.

TABLE 3.—DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986—SUMMARY TABLE

[In billions of dollars]

	Request-	Approved	Change	Percent	SASC
	ed			cut	
Procurement (less ships).....	95.4	88.7	-6.7	-7.0	91.5
Shipbuilding.....	11.4	10.7	-0.7	-5.9	10.8

TABLE 3.—DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986—SUMMARY TABLE—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Request-	Approved	Change	Percent	SASC
	ed			cut	
RDT&E.....	39.3	34.2	-5.1	-13.1	37.5
O&M.....	82.5	80.7	-1.8	-2.2	81.3
Revolving funds.....	1.9	1.8	-0.1	-5.4	1.9
Military personnel <sup>1</sup> .....	73.4	69.1	-4.3	-5.9	72.1
Civil Defense.....	.1	.1	(*)	+18.7	.1
Total.....	303.9	285.3	-18.6	-6.1	295.2

<sup>1</sup> These figures reflect the dollar impact of end strength provisions, pay raises, and other personnel matters, and are added to the total to reflect budget reality.

<sup>2</sup> The request of \$119,100,000 was increased by \$22,300,000.

Note.—\$530,000,000 was transferred from O&M to procurement. The transfer is explained in the O&M section of this report.

TABLE 4.—SUMMARY OF PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	Appropriation fiscal year 1985	Request fiscal year 1986	Percent Change over 1985	HASC fiscal year 1986	Percent Change over 1985	HASC change	Cut as percent of request
Aircraft.....	\$41.0	\$42.1	+2.7	\$38.6	-6.0	-\$3.5	-8.4
Missiles <sup>1</sup> .....	14.4	19.9	+37.8	17.9	+24.2	-2.0	-9.8
Ships.....	11.7	11.4	-2.8	10.8	-8.5	-.7	-5.9
Weapons and tracked combat vehicles.....	5.0	5.8	+17.8	5.5	+10.9	-.3	-5.9
All other procurement.....	25.0	27.6	+10.5	26.7	+6.9	-.9	-3.2
Total procurement.....	97.1	106.8	+9.9	99.4	+2.4	-7.4	-6.9

<sup>1</sup> Including Navy weapons.

Note.—Totals may not add due to rounding.

In one of its key initiatives, the committee directed a competitive procurement program for tactical fighters to begin in fiscal year 1986. The Air Force was directed to set a minimum number of F-16 and F-20 fighters that it would procure and then institute a competition for the remaining tactical fighter aircraft requirements among all suitable aircraft, to include the F-16 and F-20. In directing the competitive program, the committee specifically directed that the competition be carried out in accordance with all the procurement reforms recently enacted—such as those requiring competition in contracting, independent testing, and the development of independent cost estimates.

The executive branch has frequently criticized Congress for loading up the defense budget with "political" add-ons. On the other hand, the House Armed Services Committee has frequently criticized the Pentagon for neglecting the needs of the National Guard and Reserve. Table 5 demonstrates how those two concerns join head-on. As table 5 indicates, the House Armed Services Committee has increased the quantities requested by the Pentagon for nine different

weapon systems. Seven of those systems, however, were specifically earmarked by the committee for assignment to the National Guard or Reserve—indicated by the notation NG in table 5. The explanations for the other two add-ons are contained in the footnotes to table 5.

TABLE 5.—PROCUREMENT QUANTITIES INCREASED BY HASC

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Request		HASC	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Chaparral (missiles/fire units).....	300/0	\$110.4	<sup>1</sup> 300/36	\$197.4
Improved TOW vehicle mod.....	0	0	<sup>1</sup> 138	30.0
A-6E Intruder.....	6	202.6	<sup>1</sup> 11	293.3
CX (C-20).....	0	0	<sup>2</sup> 2	44.0
KC-130T.....	0	0	<sup>2</sup> 2	40.0
UH-60.....	0	0	<sup>2</sup> 4	25.0
M198 155-mm towed howitzer.....	35	21.0	<sup>2</sup> 60	32.0
C-130H Hercules.....	0	0	<sup>2</sup> 8	150.0
C-12 Huron.....	0	0	<sup>2</sup> 12	30.0
Total.....		334.0		841.7
Net increase from HASC action.....				507.7

<sup>1</sup> Increases assigned to the National Guard or Reserves.

<sup>2</sup> The Navy was planning to start from scratch to obtain a medium-sized passenger aircraft. The committee wants the services to use more equipment standardized across the services and here tells the Navy to use the Air Force C-20.

## PROCUREMENT

Table 4 summarizes the committee's procurement actions by major category of weapons. As the table shows, the committee authorizes less for aircraft and ships in fiscal year 1986 than was appropriated in fiscal year 1985. Altogether, the procurement portion of the budget would grow only 2.5 percent in fiscal year 1986—the procurement authorization approved by the committee represents a real difference of about 2.1 percent compared with the procurement appropriations for fiscal year 1985. The administration had requested a real increase of 5.1 percent.

<sup>3</sup> The Marine Corps planned to buy 35 of these howitzers in fiscal year 1986 and 119 in fiscal year 1987. The committee added to the buy for 1986 to reduce the procurement spike in 1987.

The executive branch talks as if any additions to the budget are pure pork. I certainly won't deny that some add-ons have been prompted over the years by other than military merit. Contrary to the Pentagon's posture, however, that is not true of all add-ons. The job of Congress is to set priorities. One of our priorities has long been the Guard and Reserve. The Pentagon is run by the active forces and tends traditionally to neglect the Guard and Reserve. We are trying to counter that bias.

The committee directed the Defense Department to develop an equipment requirements document for the Guard and Reserve to pinpoint weapons shortfalls so that the Congress and Pentagon can approach this issue more rationally in the future and reduce the need for ad hoc add-ons by the committee.

Apart from the MX missile and AMRAAM missile, which were discussed earlier, probably the most controversial weapon system in this year's procurement budget was the Sergeant York Division air defense system





centage real increase of any title in the bill, as shown in table 8.

TABLE 8.—BUDGET AUTHORITY GROWTH IN MAJOR TITLES

(In billions of current dollars)

	Fiscal year		Change	Percent real growth
	1985	1986		
Military personnel	68.9	73.4	\$4.5	1.3
O&M	78.2	82.5	4.2	6.1
Procurement	96.6	106.8	10.0	5.1
RDT&E	31.5	39.3	7.8	20.1

In just 4 years, the RDT&E account has grown by 100 percent. There has been an increased emphasis on developing systems, rather than on technology. Each service shows a preference for developing unique equipment, even where the missions of two services are similar or even identical.

The committee is concerned that the R&D growth has been excessive and threatens to generate bureaucratic pressures for huge numbers of new weapon systems in the late 1980's and 1990's.

Mr. DICKINSON, the ranking minority member of the R&D Subcommittee as well as the full committee has said:

The committee is also concerned that the overemphasis on developing systems could tend to erode the technology base. American strength is in its innovative technology and this capability must be preserved.

Finally, the committee finds far too many development programs in the Defense Department with inadequate emphasis on joint programs to cut down on duplication.

Accordingly, and following the same philosophy demonstrated in the procurement area, the committee has eliminated a number of proposed new starts and terminated several existing programs in the early stages of development.

For example, the committee deleted all funds for the Navy and Air Force joint tactical information distribution system [JTIDS]—a reduction of \$276.3 million—and added \$150 million for a common JTIDS system.

The committee terminated the Air Force joint surveillance and target attack radar system [JSTARS], for a reduction of \$260 million. This program was intended to develop an airborne battlefield radar for use in a Boeing 707. The committee believes there are other less costly alternatives for this mission. Additionally, the Defense Department has failed to comply with congressional guidance to develop a plan for a more survivable JSTARS platform than the Boeing 707.

After all actions, the committee cut the RDT&E request of \$39.3 billion by a total of \$5.1 billion or 13.1 percent.

The committee recommended that one Defense Department request be raised by 700 percent. The administra-

tion requested \$25 million for the University Initiative Program; the committee authorized \$200 million.

The number of American students enrolled in graduate schools has declined dramatically over the past decade, and university facilities and instrumentation are in many cases obsolete. Graduate students are not being exposed to the kind of high technology projects that are important to national security programs during their graduate training. The committee also wishes to see a better exchange of ideas and technology among universities, industry, and Federal laboratories. For these reasons, the committee dramatically increased the authorization for the University Initiative Program.

The committee also fenced \$450 million in funding for the high-speed antiradiation missile [Harm] until the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force certify that Harm will work. The Pentagon should be getting the quality of weapons the taxpayer is paying for and stop tacking on additional payments so that contractors can make systems work the way they promised at the outset.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE [O&amp;M]

While the O&M budget was cut by \$1.8 billion, very few of the reductions will have any impact on military operations, in keeping with the committee's emphasis on maintaining military readiness.

For example, \$530 million of the total cut, was actually shifted from O&M to procurement. The Defense Department had shifted funds from other procurement to O&M in its request as part of a proposal to allow local commanders to begin buying with O&M funds any article not centrally managed. Capital goods should be procured with procurement funds and operations should be paid for with operating funds. The Pentagon proposal violates this division and was rejected. The half billion dollars was shifted back to procurement.

Another \$1.3 billion was trimmed from the budget as a result of: First, the fall in the price of the dollar—which makes purchases abroad cheaper—second, lower fuel prices since the budget was drafted, and third, revised calculations that show stock fund cash flow exceeding what is deemed necessary.

The sum of \$290 million was eliminated from the request based on audits and investigations by the General Accounting Office and Defense Department auditors that pinpointed dozens of examples of savings ranging from better computer management to elimination of year-end spending sprees.

Another \$32 million fell out as a result of the committee action denying the full additional end strength increases requested by the services.

The committee then made \$451 million in cuts from requested program growth and added \$318 million for program increases. A third of the program increases were dedicated to the Guard and Reserve.

In addition, about \$475 million in personnel benefit increases—described in the next section—are funded in O&M.

The committee also wrote language allowing a role for Air Force Reserve special operations aircraft in Federal drug interdiction efforts. The tasks these units practice in peacetime to maintain readiness are the very tasks required to support drug interdiction efforts. The bill language allows us to kill two birds with one stone—maintaining readiness and aiding interdiction at the same time.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL

The committee approved a pay raise for all military personnel of 3 percent to take effect on January 1, 1986. This is the same raise and date approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee. The administration had requested a raise of 3 percent effective July 1, 1985.

Even with the tight budget, we felt it was important to provide a pay raise for all the ranks.

As shown in table 9, the committee approved two-thirds of the end strength increases requested by the administration.

TABLE 9.—MILITARY END STRENGTHS

	Approved 1985	Increase requested	HASC	SASC
Army	780,800	0	0	0
Navy	571,300	15,000	10,000	10,000
Marine Corps	198,300	1,200	1,200	500
Air Force	602,100	9,430	6,430	4,400
Total	2,178,100	25,630	17,630	14,900

The strength increases the committee approved are associated directly with the manning of ships in the Navy and with force structure modernization in the Air Force—for example, such programs as the B-1B bomber, air-launched cruise missile, and ground-launched cruise missile.

As cited earlier, the committee made a reduction of \$4 billion from the pay and pension accounts, and directed the Defense Department to draft language altering the military retirement program to conform to the lowered amount.

Military retirement is administered through a trust fund. Each year, the services pay into the trust fund an amount sufficient to cover the pension obligations taken on for the persons joining the military in that year. The trust fund, meanwhile, is paying out funds to current retirees.

The retirement reduction adopted by the committee will have no impact on anyone currently retired or cur-



rently serving in uniform. Benefits will be changed only for those who enter the service after the date of enactment of the new retirement program. The amount in the budget request for payment into the trust fund was \$18.2 billion; therefore, the \$4 billion reduction will equate to a reduction in benefits of about 22 percent.

The Pentagon was directed to submit its draft of new retirement legislation as quickly as possible for enactment by Congress. It was also directed to look at reform proposals that would have the effect of encouraging longer careers by service personnel.

While reducing retirement benefits, the committee raised benefits available to active-duty personnel. The bill includes about \$1.4 billion in additional benefits, mostly for what are commonly called family programs. Half of the additional money will go to better compensate service personnel for the costs incurred when they are transferred from one installation to another.

The committee also voted to change the title of one-star flag officers in the Navy. For many decades, these officers were known as rear admirals—lower half. In 1980, this was changed to com-

modore admiral, and soon thereafter, to commodore.

The Navy objected that the term commodore is not standard, in that few navies use the title. However, a check of the NATO equivalent rank chart shows that of the 11 NATO countries with a one-star naval rank, 6 use the term commodore, 2 use the term contre admiral, while the remaining 3 use other terms. Germany uses Flotillenadmiral, Greece uses archi-pleiarchos, and Turkey uses tugamiral.

While some consideration was given to identifying one-star U.S. Navy officers as tug admirals, the committee decided to return to the old standard American term, rear admiral—lower half.

#### CIVIL DEFENSE

The budget approved for fiscal year 1985 for civil defense was \$181 million. The request for 1986 is \$119 million—a reduction of one-third based on a new policy to shift those programs still 100 percent federally funded to a 50-50 matching basis with the States. The calendars of many State legislatures make it impossible for them to act in time. Therefore, the committee added \$22 million to the request to allow ade-

quate time for the States to convert to the new matching system.

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NUCLEAR PROGRAMS

The committee reduced the request of \$7,959 million by a net of \$241 million. The major change was the addition of \$145 million to restore R&D work on the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program and \$13.3 million to restore R&D work on the plasma separation process.

A total of \$175 million in new and ongoing construction projects were deferred due to budgetary constraints. A few were accelerated: An instrumentation systems laboratory at Albuquerque, NM; and an environmental clean-up facility at Livermore, CA. The basic weapons research and development activities were preserved with no real growth.

#### CIVILIAN PAY

The House Armed Services Committee does not act on civilian pay raises. They are handled by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This bill necessarily includes the administration request for a 5-percent civilian pay cut. Any later action by the Congress to change that will automatically increase the authorizations provided in this bill.●